This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

3 3433 08166402 5

The Pamphleteer;

DEDICATED

TO

BOTH HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT.

VOL. XX.

TO BE CONTINUED OCCASIONALLY,

AT

AN AVERAGE OF FOUR NUMBERS ANNUALLY.

Omnes pensantur eâdem
Scriptores trutinâ.———Hor. Epist.

London:

PRINTED BY A. J. VALPY, RED LION COURT, FLEET STREET.

SOLD BY SHERWOOD AND CO.; BLACK, KINGSBURY,
PARBURY, AND ALLEN; LONGMAN AND CO.; SIMPKIN
AND MARSHALL; W. CARPENTER; LONDON—
PARKER, OXFORD—BARRET, CAMBRIDGE—
MACREDIE AND CO. EDINBURGH— CUM-
MING, DUBLIN—AND ALL OTHER
BOOKSELLERS.

1822.

REPAIR ??? No. 6 1 8 2 '07

CONTENTS OF NO. XXXVI.

I. On the Necessity and best mode of striking off part of the National Debt. [*Original.*]

II. The Rev. W. L. Bowles's Answer to Lord Byron's Letter on the controversy about Pope. 2nd Ed. Enlarged.

III. On the Criminal Jurisprudence of the Country, with Draft of a New Penal Code. By J. T. B. Beaumont, Esq.

IV. Capt. Broughton's Letter to the Board of Agriculture. [*Original.*]

V. Letter to the Board of Trade. [*Original.*]

VI. Cornaro's Rules for attaining Long Life, and correcting a bad Constitution.

VII. Observations on the Copy-Right Bill.

VIII. On the Corn Question. [*Original.*]

IX. On Marriage and Divorce. [*Original.*]

X. A Protest against Lord Byron's immolation of Gray, Cowper and Campbell at the shrine of Pope.

XI. An Account of the Public Funded Debt, 5th January, 1820.
Ditto. Ditto. Ditto. 1821.
Ditto. Consolidated Fund, Ditto. 1820.
Ditto. Ditto. Ditto. 1821.

CONTENTS OF NO. XXXVII.

I. The Coronation Sermon. By Edward, Ld. Archbp. of York.

II. The Piedmontese Revolution. By Count Santa-Rosa, Ex-Minister. [*Exclusively translated for the Pamphleteer.*]

III. Letters of the Emperor Joseph II. to several of the most distinguished Characters of his time. [*Now first translated from the German, exclusively for the Pamphleteer.*]

IV. On the Criminal Jurisprudence of the Country, with Draft of a New Penal Code. By J. T. B. Beaumont, Esq.

V. Cornaro's Rules for attaining a Long Life, and correcting a bad Constitution.

VI. A Vindication of the People from the charge of Blasphemy, and a Defence of the Freedom of the Press. [*New Edition, with Alterations.*]

VII. On Agriculture, Currency, &c. [*Original.*]

VIII. On the tendency of the Education Bill to degrade Grammar Schools; and the importance of preserving the Classical Discipline of their Founders. By Vicesimus Knox, D. D. [*New Edition, with alterations.*]

CONTENTS OF NO. XXXIX.

PAGE.

I. The STATE of the NATION, at the commencement of the year 1822. Considered under the Four Departments of the Finance—Foreign Relations—Home Department—Colonies and Board of Trade, &c. &c. With an Appendix explanatory of recent Measures adopted by Ministers. 1

II. The RETURN to NATURE; or, a Defence of the VEGETABLE REGIMEN: with some account of an experiment made during three or four years in the Author's Family. By JOHN FRANK NEWTON, Esq. 97

III. A LETTER to the Rev. W. L. BOWLES, in Reply to his LETTER to THOMAS CAMPBELL, Esq. and to his two Letters to the Right Hon. Lord BYRON; containing a Vindication of their Defence of the POETICAL CHARACTER of POPE, and an Inquiry into the nature of Poetical Images, and of the characteristic qualities that distinguish Poetry from all other species of writing. By M. M'Dermot. 119

IV. OBSERVATIONS on TRADE, considered in reference, particularly, to the Public Debt, and to the Agriculture of the United Kingdom. By RICHARD HEATHFIELD. 145

V. A HISTORY of the PENAL LAWS against the IRISH CATHOLICS; from the Treaty of Limerick to

PAGE.

the Union. With an Index. By Sir HENRY PARNELL, Bart. M. P. [*New Edition, corrected for the Pamphleteer exclusively.*] 185

VI. Observations on the present State of the POLICE of the METROPOLIS. By GEORGE B. MAINWARING, Esq. *Second Edition, printed exclusively in the* PAMPHLETEER. [*Concluded from No. XXXVIII.*] 211

VII. The ELECTOR'S REMEMBRANCER; or, a GUIDE to VOTES of each MEMBER of the HOUSE of COMMONS, for the first two Sessions of the present Parliament. With Observations on the Conduct and Speeches of various Members.. No I. (*To be continued at the close of every succeeding Session.*) 233

CONTENTS OF NO. XXXVIII.

I. Letters of the Emperor Joseph II., written to some of the most distinguished Characters of his time. [*Now first translated from the German, exclusively for the Pamphleteer.*]

II. A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Llandaff, at the Primary Visitation in August, 1821. By William, Lord Bishop of Llandaff.

III. Anticipation: containing the substance of His Majesty's Speech to both Houses of Parliament, on the approaching Session; together with a full and authentic account of the Debate which will take place in the House of Commons, on the motion for the Address, and the Amendment. With Notes. By Richard Tickell, Esq. *London: printed* 1778.

IV. A Letter of Expostulation to Lord Byron, on his present Pursuits; with Animadversions on his Writings, and absence from his Country in the hour of danger. [*Original.*]

V. Vindiciæ Britannicæ.—A Vindication of the People from the charge of Blasphemy, and a Defence of the Freedom of the Press.

VI. On the tendency of the Education Bill to Degrade Grammar Schools; and the importance of preserving the Classical Discipline of their Founders. By Vicesimus Knox, D. D. [*New Edition, with Alterations.*]

VII. On the interests of the Church of England. By R. V. *Second Edition.*

VIII. The Return to Nature; or, a Defence of the Vegetable Regimen: with some account of an experiment made during three or four years in the Author's Family. By John Frank Newton, Esq.

IX. Observations on the present State of the Police of the Metropolis. By George B. Mainwaring, Esq. *Second Edition, printed exclusively in the Pamphleteer.*

CONTENTS OF NO. XL.

PAGE.

I. Thoughts on the Present System of Academic Education in the University of Cambridge. By Eubulus 301

II. A Letter to the Right Reverend John, Lord Bishop of Bristol, respecting an additional Examination of Students in the University of Cambridge, and the different Plans proposed for that purpose. By Philograntus 311

III. A Letter to Philograntus, by Eubulus: being a Sequel to a Pamphlet, entitled Thoughts on the Present System of Academic Education in the University of Cambridge 343

IV. A Charge, delivered by the Right Reverend Dr. John Kaye, Lord Bishop of Bristol, at his Primary Visitation of that Diocese, in August, 1821 357

V. A Letter to the Rev. W. L. Bowles, in Reply to his Letter to Thomas Campbell, Esq. and to his two Letters to the Right Hon. Lord Byron; containing a Vindication of their Defence of the Poetical Character of Pope, and an Inquiry into the nature of Poetical Images, and of the characteristic qualities that distinguish Poetry from all other species of Writing. By M. M'Dermot. [*Concluded from No. 39.*] 385

VI. The Return to Nature; or, a Defence of the Vegetable Regimen: with some account of an experiment made during three or four years in the Author's Family. By John Frank Newton, Esq. [*Concluded from No. 39.*] 411

PAGE.

VII. A HISTORY of the PENAL LAWS against the IRISH CATHOLICS; from the Treaty of Limerick to the Union. With an Index. By Sir HENRY PARNELL, Bart. M. P. [*New Edition, corrected for the Pamphleteer exclusively.*] 431

VIII. WHAT ARE RICHES? or, An Examination of the Definitions of this subject given by modern Economists. By Sir EGERTON BRYDGES, Bart. 479

IX. A PRACTICAL SCHEME for the Reduction of the PUBLIC DEBT and TAXATION, without individual sacrifice. By JONATHAN WILKS 499

X. XI. & XII. Letters to Mr. T. CAMPBELL, as far as regards POETICAL CRITICISM, &c. &c., and the ANSWER to the Writer in the QUARTERLY REVIEW, as far as they relate to the same subjects. *Second Editions.* Together with an Answer to some objections; and further Illustrations. By the Rev. W. L. BOWLES 529

CONTENTS OF NO. XXXIX.

I. ELECTOR'S REMEMBRANCER, or a Guide to the Votes of each Member of the House of Commons, in the present Parliament. Giving an account of the particular conduct of each Member; with general Observations, &c. &c. A similar work is published in France, and is of great utility.

II. The Exposé of the Present Administration, in a Pamphlet intitled The State of the Nation in 1822. Under the Four Departments—Finance, Foreign Relations, Home Department, Colonies, &c.

III. Mainwaring on the State of the Police.

IV. A Defence of the Vegetable Regimen, showing that we were not born to eat Animal Food, &c.

V. Heathfield on the Debt, Agriculture, &c.

VI. Sir H. Parnell's History of the Penal Laws against the Catholics, to the Union. [*Out of Print.*]

VII. On the Controversy between Lord Byron and Mr. Bowles, relative to Pope and Poetry.

THE

STATE OF THE NATION,

AT THE

COMMENCEMENT OF THE YEAR 1822.

CONSIDERED UNDER

THE FOUR DEPARTMENTS

OF

THE FINANCE—FOREIGN RELATIONS—
HOME DEPARTMENT—
COLONIES AND BOARD OF TRADE,
&c. &c. &c.

SIXTH EDITION.

LONDON:

1822.

STATE OF THE NATION,

&c. &c.

The purport of the following observations is to take a general review of the state of public affairs, from the period of the late treaties to the commencement of the year 1822. The circumstances which compose this review have not, as yet, been produced to the public with sufficient fulness and distinctness. If some of the matters have been touched upon, and even discussed in parliament, in answer to the observations of the opponents of his Majesty's ministers, they have been discussed only as single measures, and without any reference to their coherence with the system of administration of which they formed a part.

The ministers of a free and high-minded country cannot be without a due feeling of the value of public character. They know, that in public station, still more than in private life, a good name is connected with the due and effective performance of duties; that character is influence, and that influence is power; that power from influence will extend its operation, where power from law and positive authority cannot reach; and that the good-will of the people towards government, has in all ages proved the readiest means of an effective administration. Under these considerations, his Majesty's ministers for themselves, and their friends for them, must naturally desire to stand well in public opinion. They desire it for themselves, and they desire it for the country. For themselves, they must feel that they deserve public confidence for a conscientious and effective discharge of their duties: for the country, they must desire, and desire most anxiously, that a general feeling for the public good, and a general persuasion that the government is industriously occupied in pursuing it, may excit such a spirit of concurrent effort between the people and their governors, as to give manners the effect and authority of laws; and may bring into disuse any statutes, if such there be, required in more turbulent times to repress public disorders. Such is the general purpose of the statement and review which follow.

According to the form which the administration of the British Empire has long assumed, the public business has for a considerable period of years distributed itself into the four main departments —of Finance, the Foreign Affairs, Home Department, and the Colonies. Under the first of these departments, that of the Finance, the First Lord of the Treasury and the Chancellor of the Exchequer have it in charge to provide for the maintenance and due distribution of the public revenue, and for the integrity of all those sources of navigation, commerce, manufactures, internal trade and industry, from which such revenue must be derived; and, finally, (in co-operation with the other Boards appointed for this special service) they have to provide for the naval and military defence of the empire, and the maintenance of the docks, arsenals, ordnance, &c. in all the means and materials of future operation.

To the Home Department belong the maintenance and supervision of the public peace, and the due execution of the laws for the support of internal order and tranquillity; whilst the Departments of Foreign Affairs and the Colonies embrace, according to their denominations, our relations with foreign states and our own colonies. Following the order of these departments, it is now proposed to produce and explain to the public, in a general and succinct view, the former, and the actual condition of each; the difficulties which his Majesty's ministers had to encounter, and what, under such difficulty, they have accomplished; how they have administered the finance, and conciliated the due maintenance of the revenue in all its sources, with the due alleviation of the public burdens; how they have maintained the public peace with as little cost as possible to personal liberty; and under what system they have administered the foreign relations of the empire. This review, under the four departments, will necessarily comprehend a general survey of the proceedings of administration within the whole compass of public business. It will explain the state of our finances, and our national resources; it will open a view of our existing relations with foreign states; it will display, as a part of our domestic policy, the general system under which his Majesty's ministers have endeavoured, more by discipline than by measures of terror and menace, to restore Ireland to the ordinary administration of law. It will show what has been done for our colonies, and for the commercial interests of the empire; and what is now in discussion for the extension of our trade and manufactures, and for simplifying and facilitating mercantile business.

FINANCE.

Upon the conclusion of the war, and the consequent return of many branches of industry to those foreign nations, for whom we carried and manufactured during the period of hostilities, his Majesty's ministers saw that a twofold duty had devolved upon them —the one, that of considering the amount of the National Debt and the pressure of the annual taxation, and, under this consideration, relieving the country by making every possible saving in the public expenditure; the other, that of considering the actual condition of the trading part of the community under the contracted compass of trade in the different circumstances of peace and war—and, under these circumstances, not adding to the difficulties of a large body of men by withdrawing suddenly too great a portion of the national capital. From the conclusion of the war to the present period, his Majesty's ministers have accordingly directed their steady attention to this object, so qualified; namely, to such a reduction of the annual burdens as might in its degree be consistent with the due maintenance of the public service—and, in its mode, not discharge with a dangerous precipitancy too large a portion of the circulating capital of the kingdom.

Under these circumstances, the inquiry into the financial conduct of his Majesty's ministers appears naturally to divide itself into the two points:

First, what reductions have been made by them in the annual expenditure and taxation of the country, from the conclusion of the war to the present period;—whether the public service could admit of any further reductions than those actually made; and whether they have not been carried into effect at the first practicable opportunity.

Secondly, what is the actual state of the main sources of the national revenue and public wealth—whether they are entire and unimpaired; and whether they justify a confidence for the present, and a strong expectation for the future.

The examination of the question in these subdivisions will produce the whole subject fairly and fully before the public, and will enable the British people to determine, whether, in the administration of the finances, his Majesty's Government have performed their duty, and have accomplished as much as could reasonably be expected under the circumstances of the country.

First, therefore, *what reductions have been made by his Majesty's ministers, in the annual expenditure and taxation of the country, from the conclusion of the war to the present period.*

Upon the conclusion of the war, in 1815, the first and anxious consideration of his Majesty's ministers was to make such a reduction in the establishments, as might be consistent with the security of the empire, and its station among European powers. In considering this question, the immediate subject of inquiry was, the general basis upon which the future peace establishment should be estimated. The peace establishment of 1792 naturally suggested itself to their consideration. As in all political questions it is not only matter of prudence and policy, but contributes much to thefacility of business, to proceed according to some acknowledged rule, his Majesty's ministers adopted this estimate in the first instance subject, however, to the qualifications rendered necessary by a new state of things, and by an actual knowledge (which they personally possessed) that Mr. Pitt himself had often regretted that he had taken the establishment of 1792 at too low a scale, and was therefore obliged to augment it in time of peace. With these qualifications, his Majesty's ministers adopted the peace estimate of 1792.

Having assumed this basis, the next process was to consider in what respect the general state of the nation, and its relations with the other powers of Europe, on the conclusion of the war, differed from the condition of the country in 1792; and what augmentation was necessary for the new circumstances severally considered. The new peace establishment, whatever it might be, was to be distributed through the four branches—of Great Britain, Ireland, and the old and new colonies. In Great Britain, in 1792, the peace establishment was 17,000 men. Now, in the condition of Great Britain at the conclusion of the war, there were two main circumstances which essentially distinguished her situation from that of 1792. Her great increase of population, amounting at least to one-fifth; and, without intending to express any doubt of the loyalty and patriotism of the great body of this happy country, it must be added, that there was assuredly somewhat of a new state of the public mind, and a new force given to public passions, in the peculiar form which the press of that day had already assumed. There was yet a third, and fourth circumstance, in the enlarged basis and frame-work of the army and navy themselves, and in the new system of relieving foreign garrisons, so happily adopted; that of relieving by regiments, instead of drafts. Under the collective effect of these several circumstances, his Majesty's ministers were led into the necessary conclusion, that an augmentation of at least one-third of the establishment of 1792 was necessary for the home-establishment in Great Britain in 1816. They accordingly took this estimate, namely, 25,000 men, as the immediate peace establishment of England.

The next consideration was the establishment of Ireland. In 1792, the amount of this establishment had been taken at 12,000 men. The strong and concurrent representations of the Irish government and magistracy convinced his Majesty's ministers, that at least double this number was now necessary for the security of personal property, for the collection of the revenue, and for the due support of the laws and authorities. Owing to the long period of war, 36,000 men had been constantly maintained in that kingdom, and had found sufficient occupation in guarding her domestic peace. At the very period when his Majesty's ministers were considering this question of the future establishment for Ireland, there were no less than four hundred military quarters or stations distributed through the Irish counties; and daily representations were made to the government, upon the temporary removal of any of them, that the persons and property of the protestant inhabitants were endangered. Under these circumstances, his Majesty's ministers took the future peace establishment for Ireland at 25,000 men.

The consideration next in order was the establishment of the old colonies. In 1792 the allowance for this portion of the empire was 17,000 men. Upon investigating this part of our establishment, it was immediately seen, that the colonies likewise presented an aspect very different from their condition in 1792. The old colonies were Gibraltar, the North American Colonies (Canada, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and the Bahama Islands), Jamaica, and the Leeward Islands. In 1792 the force there stationed was 17,000; but, upon looking at the state of each severally, it was seen that an addition was now required. In 1792 the force at Gibraltar was 4000 men. This was deemed sufficient for 1816. In the North American colonies, Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, the force in 1792 was 5000 men. From the new circumstances of Canada, and from its new relations with the United States, it was necessary to increase this force; and upon consulting with military men acquainted with the frontiers and the nature of the country, it was found that a great addition was now necessary for the security of British North America. It was particularly represented to his Majesty's ministers under this head, by the local authorities, that the navigation of the Canadian rivers was often interrupted for months together; and that, upon any sudden breach with America, concurring with an insufficient force in Canada, the country might be overwhelmed by an incursion, before the possible arrival of troops from remote stations. They were further reminded of its growing importance to the commerce, and particularly to the navigation, of the United Empire; and it was recalled to their recollection, that the vessels employed in our trade with Canada amounted to nearly one-fourth of the tonnage of the British Empire. Under these circumstances, the estimate for the North American colonies was taken at 9000 men. In 1792, the force at Jamaica was about 2000 men. But in its present condition, there were two strong additional circumstances: the first, the growth of the black state of Hayti in its immediate vicinity; and the second, the growth of the colony itself, and the anxious representations of the colonists, of their state of insecurity with an insufficient force. As respected the progressive growth of the colony, and its actual importance to the general trade of the empire, it was represented to ministers, that the British capital employed in Jamaica exceeded sixty millions; and that in the year 1815 the island had exported ninety-eight thousand hogsheads of sugar; that this had employed twenty-one thousand tons of British shipping, and five thousand British seamen, and had afforded two millions to the revenue of the country; a sum amounting to within half a million of the ordinary charge of the whole army of England. Upon this representation the new estimates for Jamaica were taken at four thousand men. The force for the Leeward Islands in 1792, had been four thousand two hundred men. Under the same circumstances of the vicinity of a new black empire, of the progressive growth of the colonies, and of the establishment of some naval docks and arsenals, not immediately removable, the estimate for these islands was now taken at five thousand men. The whole colonial estimate for the old colonies was thus settled, in the first instance, at twenty-three thousand; a peace establishment exceeding that of 1792, for the same stations, by seven thousand men: an addition resting upon the principles above explained, of the growth of the colonies themselves, and of the progress of adjoining states.

The final consideration, as to the estimates for the new peace establishment, regarded the new colonies. In 1792, the number of our colonies was only twenty-six. In 1816, they had increased to forty-three. These new colonies were—Malta, the Ionian Islands, the African settlements, St. Helena, Ceylon, the Cape of Good Hope, Mauritius, Surinam, Trinidad, Berbice, Essequibo, St. Lucie, and Tobago. The estimates of 1792 of course afforded no rule for the future establishment of these colonies. But another criterion naturally suggested itself; that of the force which the former possessors of those colonies deemed to be necessary for their defence and administration. According to this measure, their collective peace establishment was thus primarily taken at twenty-three thousand men. Ministers saw, indeed, that the same amount of force would not always be necessary for this service; but that portions might be withdrawn gradually, as the colonists became accustomed to the superior administration of British laws. But as all these colonies were conquests, and as the greater part of them had experienced the contagion of French revolutionary principles; as the inhabitants of nearly all were at that time adverse; and as the greater portion were impatient, turbulent, and even democratically inclined; it was deemednecessary to take the estimate at the above standard.

Upon these principles, the total peace establishment was taken at 99,000 men; thirty thousand of which (twenty-three thousand for the new colonies, and seven thousand for the new mode of relieving distant garrisons by regiments instead of by drafts) were required for services entirely new, and not having any existence in 1792. Thirteen thousand more of this number were required, in the unanimous opinion of all parties, as an addition to the former establishment for Ireland, and two thousand for Jamaica, under her new relation of neighbourhood to Hayti. With these deductions, it will be immediately seen that there was a very near correspondence in the estimates for the two periods of 1792, and 1816. The main and indeed the sole difference was in the small addition to Canada and the Leeward Islands; the actual addition to the home force in Great Britain being chiefly for the relief by regiments to our remote garrisons.

As such were the reductions made in the army with respect to the number of men to be retained in pay and service, the reduction proposed, and afterwards executed within the year, for the navy, was still more considerable. The peace establishment was here taken at thirty-three thousand men, being an immediate reduction of upwards of seventy thousand; and, including the public yards connected with this service, of upwards of one hundred thousand men. The result of the reduction in these two heads of the public service was briefly, that before the end of the year of 1816, and before the meeting of the session of parliament for the year following, upwards of three hundred thousand soldiers and sailors had been disembodied and discharged from the public service. From the end of 1814, the earliest moment from which it was possible to commence the work of retrenchment, two hundred and twenty-one thousand eight hundred men had been disbanded from the regular force. And in the year 1816, this amount of reduction was augmented by a further discharge of fifty-six thousand three hundred and forty-three men, disbanded before the conclusion of that year. In the speech by which the session of 1816 was opened, his present Majesty had commanded the commissioners to assure the parliament, that they might rely on every disposition upon his part to concur in such measures of economy as might be found consistent with the security of the country, and with the station which we occupy in Europe. In this manner did his Majesty's ministers redeem this pledge of public economy and reduction in the establishments. Considering the magnitude of force upon which reductions were to be made; the variety and complexity of the interests concerned; the number and remoteness of the stations; the diminution of demand upon the trade and commerce of the country; and the general stagnation consequent upon the first transition from war to peace; it is assuredly not too much to assert, that in such an interval of time, and from such a national force, no period of our history exhibits such an amount of reduction.

As such was the reduction of the number of men in the naval and military service, it was attended, as a matter of course, by a similar diminution in the yearly supplies for these services. It would be impertinent to the present purpose of these remarks to repeat in detail the estimates of past years; the object is briefly to establish the first position of our statement; that his Majesty's ministers have made all possible reductions in the public expenditure, and commenced such reductions at the first possible period. Suffice it therefore to add, as regards the supplies of the year 1816, that, when compared with the estimates of the previous year, the public expenditure was reduced by upwards of seventy millions. In the three branches, the Army, Navy, and Ordnance, nearly forty millions were at once struck off. As respected the burdens of the country, eighteen millions of taxes were repealed within the same year; a sum exceeding the whole of the national revenue, before the war, by two millions. Under all these circumstances, it is assuredly but justice to his Majesty's ministers to acknowledge, that in the arrangement of the peace establishment at the end of the war, and in the amount and promptitude of the reductions, they satisfied every reasonable expectation. Nor should it be forgotten under this part of the subject, that they raised the whole supply of the year, still necessarily large, (twenty-seven millions) without the imposition of any new taxes, and by the sole aid of an advantageous bargain with the Bank of England.

Having laid this ground-work for the future peace establishment in 1816, it will immediately appear, that his Majesty's ministers have followed up the same plan of economy and reduction to the present period.

Upon this principle they continued progressively to reduce the amount of the public expenditure. In 1816, the estimate for the army was taken at 99,000 men. In the year 1817, the colonies newly attached to our empire having become more firmly settled, and the internal tranquillity of Ireland assuming a more promising aspect, this estimate was reduced to 81,000, being a reduction of nearly 18,000 men. In the year 1816, the number of men taken as the estimate for the navy, was 33,000. For the year 1817, the estimate was reduced to 19,000, a reduction of nearly one half, or 14,000 men, from the former amount. In the supplies, there was the same earnest and zealous reduction, and ready and sincere economy. In 1816, the supply of the army for this first year of the peace establishment had been taken at 10,564,000. For the year 1817, the supply was taken at a small excess beyond nine millions; a reduction of nearly two millions in this branch only. In 1816, the supply for the navy was taken at 9,434,000. In 1817, this supply was reduced to six millions. The ordnance for 1816, exceeded one million and a half. For 1817, it was reduced by nearly half a million. The miscellaneous for 1816, had been estimated at two millions and a half. For 1817, it was reduced to seventeen hundred thousand pounds. The total supply for 1816, had exceeded twenty-seven millions. For 1817, the total supply was a small excess above twenty-two millions, being a reduction of five millions upon the expenditure of the year. Such, therefore, were the further reductions made in the year 1817, beyond those of 1816. The army was reduced from 99,000 to 81,000 men. The navy was reduced from 33,000 to 19,000. The expense of the army was reduced from eleven millions to nine millions. The expense of the navy was reduced from ten to six. The ordnance was reduced nearly one fourth in its whole expenditure. The miscellaneous more than one third, and the whole annual expenditure was reduced by one fifth.

As respects the Ways and Means of the same year, it may be sufficient to state, without entering into a minute financial detail, that about nine millions and a half of the supply of this year were raised from the ready-money sources annually at the disposal of government; such as the annual duties, lotteries, old stores, &c.; that the remaining twelve millions were raised by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, on exchequer bills, instead of a loan; and this issue was made upon such advantageous terms, as to save government nearly half a million in the computed difference between the interest of exchequer bills and the expense of a loan. By a most acute and assiduous attention to the state of the money-market, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had relieved it in due time, by paying off twenty-seven millions out of forty-two of the floating unfunded debt; and having thus left fifteen millions only in the market, he was enabled to raise the twelve millions required for the service of the year by the cheap and easier process of exchequer bills, instead of loan. The effect of this vigilant attention to the money-market, on the part of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and of the above measure, which arose from it, was such an improvement in the state of the public credit, that the stocks, which in 1816 had been generally at 62, had risen to 74 in the commencement of the year 1817; being an improvement of 12 per cent. on the hundred pounds stock, and of nearly 20 upon the hundred pounds sterling. Exchequer bills, which had been at 5¼ per cent. in 1816, were reduced in 1817 to 3¼ per cent. only; a reduction, which, together with other circumstances, rendered the raising the supply of the year by exchequer bills so much more advantageous than resorting to a loan.

There were two further circumstances in the financial history of the year 1817, which prove the attention of ministers at once to a just economy in the national expenditure, and to the due relief of the industry of the laboring classes suffering under the temporary pressure of an adverse season. The first of these measures was the appropriation of a million and a half of money by government to commissioners, for the employment of the poor. The second was the bill for the abolition of sinecures.

The former of these measures was rendered necessary by the peculiar difficulty under which the year 1817 was commenced. This year opened with a considerable deficiency, not less indeed than ten per cent. on the whole amount of the public revenue; with a harvest less than an average by at least one-third, and with a most material reduction in our general commerce, trade, and industry. This reduction indeed necessarily followed the cessation of the large war expenditure amongst ourselves, and the resumption by the continental nations, of those several branches of navigation, commerce, and manufacture, which, though originally belonging to themselves, had, during the war and the hostile occupation of their soil, been transferred to Great Britain. Suffice it to say of this temporary aid, that it was as cheerfully given as it was imperiously required.

The second circumstance, the abolition of sinecures, was a concession to popular opinion, and was chiefly of public value, inasmuch as it afforded the occasion of producing before the public the real state of a question upon which they had been much deluded. According to the popular writers of the day, and even to some of the members of the House of Commons, who hastily and unwarrantably adopted the assertions of such authorities, much of the public distress was imputable to the lavish expenditure of government and ministers. In the discussion of the bill for the abolition of sinecures, it appeared that the whole amount of them did not exceed one hundred thousand pounds; that there were not more than three of them of any considerable annual income; that they were part of the funds of the crown, for rewarding civil services; and that, with scarcely any exception, they had been given to the families of high public officers, in lieu of pensions to which their services had entitled them. Under such circumstances the country could gain little by the abolition of sinecures, which were effectually pensions with the name of offices. But, under the current delusion of the day, the bill was demanded by the popular voice, and was cheerfully conceded by his Majesty's ministers. They deemed it, however, and they doubtless still deem it, a duty of candor, not to catch at a praise to which they had no just claim: they gave the bill because the public demanded it; but they stated that its value was nothing, and upon this score to nothing do they lay claim.

The year 1818 opened under a more favorable aspect than the preceding year, and the ministers found themselves in a condition of prosecuting their resolute purpose of reducing the national expenditure. The supply of the year was accordingly taken upon a reduced scale, through all the four branches—the army, navy, ordnance, and miscellaneous.

For the year 1817 the supply for the army had been nine millions and eighty thousand pounds; for 1818 it was eight millions nine hundred thousand pounds. In the navy, the supply for 1817 was seven millions five hundred and ninety-six thousand pounds, which included a sum for the reduction of the navy debt. In 1818 it was six millions four hundred and fifty-six thousand pounds, being a saving of nearly one million in the navy. The ordnance for 1817 was one million two hundred and seventy thousand pounds; for 1818 it was one million two hundred and forty-five thousand pounds. The miscellaneous for 1817 was one million seven hundred and ninety-five thousand pounds: for 1818 it was one million seven hundred and twenty thousand pounds. For the year 1817, the total of the supply for these four branches of the expenditure had been a small excess above twenty millions. For the year 1818, the same supply was a small excess above eighteen millions, a saving of nearly two millions upon the former year.

In the financial history of this year, it is an act of justice to the Chancellor of the Exchequer not to omit the effective expedient by which he provided the Ways and Means. Including the interest upon exchequer bills, and the Sinking Fund, upon their amount, the total supply for the year was about twenty-one millions. Of this amount about seven millions and a quarter were, of course, raised in the usual way, by the annual unappropriated taxes, the lottery, old stores, and arrears of war duties. Of the remaining fourteen millions, three millions were procured by the sale and transfer of stock from funds of a lower to a higher denomination of interest; the difference of value of the two stocks, about eleven per cent. being paid to government for the exchange.

This exchange was made from stock of three per cent. to stock of three and a half. The principle of this measure was to raise so much of the required sums for the service of the year without increasing the nominal capital of the debt; that is to say, by creating a new three and a half per cent. stock out of the three per cent. stock; or, in other words, extinguishing so much of the three per cent. by converting it into three and a half per cent. and taking the difference from the purchaser for the public service of the year. The remaining eleven millions were raised in the usual way by the issue of exchequer bills; but that the money-market might not be disadvantageously affected by such an issue, this measure was accompanied by withdrawing and funding twenty-seven millions of debt and exchequer bills previously floating. This reduction of the floating debt was as seasonable this year as the increase of it had been useful in the preceding. In 1817 the Chancellor of the Exehequer had raised the money for the service of the year by exchequer bills rather than by a loan, because there was a saving in this process, and because the state of the unfunded debt in the market admitted the operation. The event justified the prudence of this preference, stocks having risen under its effect from seventy-five to eighty, being a saving to government of five per cent., or nearly two millions upon the capital of the loan. But whilst this constituted a good reason for having increased the unfunded debt, in 1817, the actual quantity of it in the market, in 1818, formed a reason equally strong for its reduction at that period. Both measures, therefore, had been equally seasonable, according to the different circumstances of the money-market in the two years.

It was another feature in the Finance of this year, that though eighteen millions had been added to the unfunded debt, fifty millions had been paid off the national debt in the course of three years; so that the country had in fact paid off nearly three times as much as it had added, and the beneficial operation of the Sinking Fund was in full activity. In a word, the summary of the financial history for the year 1818 is, that, under the head of the current supply of the year, two millions were reduced from the amount of the former year; that, under the Ways and Means, three millions were raised without adding to the nominal amount of the national debt, and that about sixteen millions were paid off. The funds were raised from seventy-five to eighty, and the public credit of government so elevated in the money-market, as to open no distant prospect of the reduction of the four and five per cent. stock by an advantageous bargain with the capitalists. The number of the army was equally reduced with the amount of the supply. In 1817 the amount of men for Great Britain, Ireland, and the Colonies, was eighty-one thousand men. The number of men for the same service in 1818 was seventy-eight thousand men. This reduction was made on the Irish establishment only. In 1816 the amount for Ireland had been twenty-five thousand; in 1817 this had been reduced to twenty-two thousand; and in 1818 to twenty thousand. With such good faith to the country did ministers continue to adhere to their pledge in reduction and economy.

In the following year, 1819, the finances of the country, under this steady and uniform system of retrenchment, continued progressively to improve. The effects of the war, and of the sudden transition to a state of peace, were gradually passing away; and our navigation, trade, and commerce, were now adapting themselves to their new channels. It is true that our agricultural interests were not apparently restored to a firm and solid basis. Our agriculturists, like our manufacturers, had so extended the basis of their supply during the war, as to raise a produce considerably exceeding the general and ordinary demand, and by such an excess they necessarily reduced the price of corn.

In the speech by which the Prince Regent opened the session of parliament of the year 1819, his Royal Highness, as respected the financial state of that year, congratulated the country upon three new circumstances in the public condition—the withdrawing the army from France; the great reduction of the naval and military establishment; and the progressive improvement of the revenue in all its sources. By the evacuation of France, though the army in that country was chiefly supported by the French government, the British empire was necessarily relieved of much extraordinary expenditure, which could not be carried to the account of the pay and sustenance of the troops. In January, 1818, the revenue had been fifty-one millions and a half. In January, 1819, the same revenue had increased to fifty-four millions, an augmentation of three millions and a half upon the face of the accounts. But as the fifty-one millions of 1818 were in fact only raised to that amount by including an extraneous sum of four millions belonging to the arrears of war duties, property-tax, &c. the proper income of 1818 did not exceed forty-eight millions; and of course the real increase in 1819 was upwards of five millions, an increase exceeding ten per cent. upon the whole amount of the revenue and permanent taxes. In 1818 the committee of finance had estimated the whole revenue of the country at fifty-one millions and a half, and the expenditure at fifty millions, leaving a balance of one million and a half towards the expenses of the year. But the revenue of 1819 exceeded this estimate by three millions and a half. The condition of the revenue of 1819, was therefore such as to give an increase of three millions and a half towards the expenses of the year.

In taking the estimates for the supply of this year, his Majesty's ministers did not so presume upon this improved state of the public revenue, as to augment the establishments for the public service; but, on the contrary, persevered in their uniform efforts still further to diminish the expenditure. Throughout the four ordinary branches of the annual expenditure they took the supply at a diminished estimate. It is true, indeed, that the successive reductions, during the three former years, had almost exhausted the possibility of further economy, and that little remained to do where so much had already been done. But, under the actual burden of the national debt, the saving of even half a million in the whole expenditure was an important alleviation. Accordingly they directed their efforts to a further economy, and they accomplished this reduction. In the year 1818 the supply taken for the army was eight millions nine hundred and seventy thousand. In the year 1819, the supply for the same head was eight millions nine hundred thousand. For the year 1818 the supply for the navy was six millions four hundred and fifty-six thousand pounds. For the year 1819 the supply for the same service was six millions four hundred and thirty-six thousand. In 1818 the vote for the ordnance was one million two hundred and forty-five thousand pounds. In 1819 this estimate was diminished to one million one hundred and ninety-one thousand pounds. In 1818, the miscellaneous was taken at one million seven hundred and twenty thousand pounds. In 1819, the supply for this branch, was one million nine hundred and fifty thousand. The aggregate saving on the whole of the estimates, on the account for the year, was about half a million. The total amount of the supply for these four services for 1819 was thus a small excess above eighteen millions four hundred thousand; but including the interest of exchequer bills for the service of the year, and thus removed from the market, the total supply was twenty millions four hundred thousand pounds.

There were, moreover, two special demands belonging to the year 1819; the one for five millions in repayment to the Bank of five of the ten millions owing to that establishment; the other, also, for five millions in discharge of exchequer bills. The whole sum to be raised for the ordinary and extraordinary service of the year was a small excess above thirty millions. The Ways and Means of the year, for raising this large amount, and for establishing public credit upon a solid basis, were distinguished by two new measures; the one, a compliance with the recommendation of the finance committee in imposing new taxes to the amount of three millions, in aid of a surplus from the Consolidated Fund; the other, a loan of twelve millions from the Sinking Fund, for the service of the year. The first of these measures necessarily paved the way for the adoption of the other, and, together with the actual amount of the Sinking Fund, (now nearly fourteen millions), added to the benefit of deriving some present relief from its immense accumulation, induced the ministers to yield to the strong representation of public opinion, and to raise a portion of the service of the year by the appropriation of some of this excess. The finance committee had passed a resolution, that the national finances of the country would not be established upon a basis sufficiently solid and permanent, until the income of the year should exceed the expenditure by at least five millions. In order to raise the income of the country so as to produce this surplus, the same committee had recommended that three millions of new taxes should be imposed. Such was the origin of the new taxes The total supply for the year 1819, was therefore raised by the produce of the unappropriated annual taxes, by the three millions of new taxes, by twelve millions taken from the Sinking Fund, and the remainder by loan and exchequer bills.

It is assuredly not too much to say, that in the imposition of four out of five of these new taxes, the Chancellor of the Exchequer made such a selection of the subject-matter upon which they were imposed, that the burden of them is in practice so insensibly felt, that not one person out of five hundred can enumerate the subjects taxed. Indeed, so considerately, and with such just selection, were these new taxes imposed, that, up to the present period, they are paid by the consumer, and almost by the dealer, without the consciousness of any increase.

A third measure in the history of the finance of 1819, and which has only not received its due praise, because, like many other measures of his Majesty's ministers, the process of it has been less ostentatious than the effect visible, was in the transfer of several articles, under the heads of coffee, tea, cocoa, pepper, and tobacco, from the customs to the excise; by the effect of which almost all the expense of the officers hitherto employed in one department of the custom-house was saved, and a very considerable reduction thus made in the general expense of collection. It would far exceed the possible extent of this summary, to enumerate the many other examples of this mode of economy, in which, so much, and with so little pretension, has been saved to the nation. With his Majesty's ministers, economy has been a business, and reduction a duty; and they have felt it more to their honor to act than to talk. If they could reconcile it to their personal feelings to produce a claim to the public gratitude, with as much frequency and pertinacity, as their opponents can deem it consistent with candor to repeat day after day the same exploded charges; if in acts of duty, as in acts of grace, this *commemoratio beneficiorum* was not *quasi exprobatio in ingratam patriam*; if it were as much a matter of course to repeat one's own deserts, as it appears to be to reiterate popular calumnies; it would be easy for ministers or their advocates to produce a long account of services of this nature, and to vindicate their claim to an uniform course of economy in every branch of the public service.

A fourth and prominent feature in the finances of the year 1819, was the bill, now popularly denominated Mr. Peel's bill; in which his Majesty's ministers first acted upon their resolute purpose to restore the currency to its original state; and, in the resumption of cash-payments, to re-establish the ancient security against an excessive issue of paper-money. It is but justice to recall to public recollection, that through all the difficulties of the latter period of the war, they never lost sight of this purpose. In distinction from the merely speculative opinions of their political adversaries, they never regarded the question of cash and paper to be a mere question of saving, as respected the price of bullion and coin. On the contrary, in concurrence with all practical men of the present day, they considered the main and principal value of cash payments to be in the single circumstance, that they contained in themselves a control and security against a too extensive issue of paper, and confined such issues to the real exigencies of trade and business. It is unnecessary to suggest the difficulties with which ministers had to contend in accomplishing this great national object of cash-payments; for national it may truly be called, inasmuch as if ministers had consulted their own personal convenience, and the facility of the administration, they would either not have attempted this measure at all, or have postponed it to a remoter period. It was not one of those measures into which they were pushed, either by party contest, or popular clamor. Their political adversaries were divided amongst themselves even as to the expediency of the object; and a very large portion of them advised and recommended a measure, which, though in form apparently the same, would in its practical operation, and by the difficulties in the way of procuring circulating cash, have perpetuated the paper system. But with the simplicity, and it is not too much to add, with the sincerity and directness, which have always distinguished the acts of the present government, ministers resolved upon a real and not a *nominal* execution of what they deemed a public service. Accordingly, the enactments of Mr. Peel's bill were directed at once to the resumption of cash-payments, and they have effected their purpose. When time shall have cleared away the political prejudices of the day, and public measures shall be regarded according to their real character, it will become the long praise of his Majesty's ministers, that they held this steady confidence in the resources of the country and in the firmness of the public mind; for as it has been justly observed by one of the most intelligent of the political adversaries of administration, England is the only country who has ever attempted to retrace her steps from paper to bullion payments. As to the personal difficulties with which ministers had to contend in their execution of this measure, they had, in the first instance, to repay the Bank the large debt due to that establishment. They had doubtless, likewise to forego some portion of the ordinary aid of that company, in raising the supplies for the two following years. In a word, they had to make sacrifices from their own interests, and to demand sacrifices from a public body, which, in its due relations, had always concurred with the government in assisting the public service. Without admitting, in any thing like their full extent, the assertions of popular writers and speakers, of the certain effects of this resumption of cash-payments upon trade, commerce, and industry, they foresaw that it must be attended with some degree of public suffering, and they did not affect to conceal it in the discussion which preceded the bill. But the merit is theirs of not having given too much weight to opinions merely speculative. It is certain, that upon the commencement of this bill in operation, the prices of agricultural produce and of general merchandize were much depressed; but it is now equally certain, that this depression of prices was rather a concurrent incident than a consequent effect. In agriculture, as in manufactures, prices had become depressed, because the supply existed in a temporary excess beyond the demand. In manufactures, the capital and machinery, enlarged and accumulated during the war, had not yet withdrawn itself within the limits belonging to general commerce during a peace. In agriculture, successive abundant seasons in England and Ireland, added to the same cause which operated in manufactures, (an enlarged basis of cultivation and supply, and the absence and diminution of the demand and waste of war) produced the same effects; and corn became cheap, not because money was dear, but because corn was plentiful. If the price of money have risen, it has at least risen in no proportion to the depression of prices in corn and manufactures. But, to say the truth, this is the common error of that portion of the opponents of government who may be termed the economists. In the absence of all practical experience, they assign infinitely too much to their abstract and theoretical principles. They carry tò the account of their theories, what, to all but themselves, are but the manifest effects of the most common causes.

As respects the following year 1820, and the further attempts of the ministers to continue their reductions, the same general observations apply as to the preceding year; that so much had already been done, as almost to exhaust the fund of further economy and retrenchment. In every branch of the public service, the establishments (as then appeared not only to his Majesty's ministers, but to that portion of country gentlemen usually voting with the Opposition) had been cut down to the lowest possible degree consistent with their efficiency. In Ireland, as we have before observed, the successive reduction of three years had diminished the military establishment from twenty-five thousand to twenty thousand men. In the colonies, during the same period, a gradual reduction had been made from forty-six thousand men to thirty-two. In Great Britain, or the home-service, the original peace establishment had been taken at twenty-six thousand men; and, though several attempts had been made to reduce it, such diminution had been found inconsistent with the due maintenance of the public peace, and with the due relief of our foreign garrisons, upon the new system of regiments instead of drafting. The year 1820 afforded a strong illustration of the necessity of this force for the home service. By the increased circulation of libellous papers, and by a new form of libelling almost peculiar to the present times—that of the cheap publications—the mind of the lower classes had become so corrupted and inflamed, as not only to excite an apprehension for the security of person and property in our manufacturing towns and counties, but to induce the country magistracy, throughout the kingdom in general, to apply to ministers for a further military protection. It does not fall within the purpose of our present observations to enter into the detail of those applications. Suffice it to say, that there was almost a general call upon ministers to increase the military establishment for the home service.—Under these circumstances, it became necessary, in the year 1820, to make a small addition for the service of Great Britain.—The opponents of his Majesty's ministers would have exhibited more candor if they had less laboriously concealed this necessity from the public eye; if they had thrown this augmentation upon the public call, instead of objecting to it as an act proceeding from the ministers themselves. But have not his Majesty's ministers still some justice to complain, that this objection has not unfrequently proceeded from the mouths of those who have themselves most strongly invoked this increase of military force in their own respective counties?—A loose rein must undoubtedly be given to political conflict—but surely there are such things as gentlemanly honor and fair dealing.

Under these circumstances, it is no small praise belonging to the supplies for the year 1820, that in those new perils of the public peace, and in this unforeseen necessity of augmenting the home-military establishment, the total of the annual supplies of 1820 exceeded by so small an amount the supplies for 1819. This excess was of course in the army and the miscellaneous. In 1819 the supply for the army had been eight millions nine hundred thousand. In 1820 it was nine millions four hundred thousand. In 1819 the supply for the navy had been six millions four hundred thousand. In 1820 it was six millions five hundred thousand. In 1819 the ordnance had been one million a hundred and ninety thousand. In 1820 it was nearly the same. In 1819 the miscellaneous, upon making up the account for the year, was a small excess beyond two millions. In 1820 it was two millions five hundred thousand. The total amount of the ordinary annual service, for the year 1819, had been twenty millions four hundred thousand, and a small fraction. For the year 1820 it was twenty millions seven hundred thousand, and a small fraction. The increase of 1820 was, therefore, little more than a quarter of a million. The total supply of the year, including a sum required for a further reduction of the unfunded debt, was twenty-nine millions seven hundred thousand.

As regarded the Ways and Means, the supply was raised in the usual manner—by the annual taxes, by exchequer-bills, and by taking twelve millions from the Sinking Fund. If the amount of the Sinking Fund, which in 1819 did not exceed fourteen millions, rendered this measure politic in the preceding year, when it was first adopted, still more advisable had it become under the circumstances of that fund in 1820, when its amount was seventeen millions, and when, upon a comparison of the money taken and left, there was a surplus of five millions in the hands of the commissioners.

One of the main features in the financial history of this year was the settlement of the Civil List upon the accession of his present Majesty. It was settled upon the plan of 1816. The unanimous assent and approbation of all parties render it unnecessary to go into detail on this subject.

In the year 1821, ministers persevered, so far as the new circumstances of the country would allow, in their efforts to reduce the national burdens. In the preceding year, they had been much embarrassed and counteracted in these attempts, by the interruption of the tranquillity of the kingdom from the practices of incendiary writers and speakers. These practices had rendered the security of the public peace paramount even to the great objects of national economy. It was in vain to reduce the expenditure unless we first defended the common safety. In the great conflict with the common enemy abroad, we had come out glorious and unimpaired. It was a more perilous contest with that large portion of our own community, who were deluded by the seditious writers and orators of the day. By the firmness of parliament, and, we presume, it may be added, by the timely prudence of ministers, this conflict has now successfully concluded, and with as small a substraction from the securities of our constitutional liberties, as was consistent with the magnitude of the danger. If it were necessary to confirm this observation by any fact or argument, it would be amply sufficient to recall to public recollection, that the Six Acts, as they were termed, passed for this purpose, were carried through the House with the almost unanimous consent of the country gentlemen. The *fons et origo mali*, the intolerable licentiousness of the press, and more particularly in its new form of cheap publications, was indeed so obviously swelling into a torrent, menacing every thing in its way, and, by sap or assault, attacking every fence of the social fabric, that it had become a common cause to apply the vigor of the law in defence of the public safety.

Under the operation of these acts the year 1821 opened with a better prospect for his Majesty's ministers, as regarded even the success of their future economical efforts: they accordingly resumed these efforts, and immediately acted upon them. In the speech by which his Majesty opened the sessions of parliament for the year, a pledge was given for these further reductions. Accordingly, both the estimates, and afterwards the supplies, were taken at a reduced rate, as compared with the service of the previous year.

In 1820, the total supply actually taken when making up the accounts of the year, appeared to be thirty millions. In 1821 the total supply did not exceed twenty millions; a reduction of demand upon the resources of the country of ten millions. In 1820 the total for the four ordinary divisions of the annual expenditure, the army, navy, ordnance, and miscellaneous, had exceeded nineteen millions six hundred thousand. In 1821 the total for the same service was eighteen millions; a reduction of nearly two millions in the ordinary annual expenditure. This saving had been distributed through all the heads of service. For 1820 the supply for the army had been nine millions four hundred thousand and a fraction. For 1821 the supply taken was eight millions seven hundred thousand. In 1820 the supply for the navy was six millions five hundred thousand and a fraction. For 1821 the supply for the same service was six millions one hundred thousand and a fraction. For 1820 the supply for the ordnance had been nearly one million two hundred thousand. For 1821 the same supply was one million one hundred and ninety-five thousand. For 1820 the miscellaneous was two millions four hundred thousand and a fraction. For 1821 the same service was taken at one million nine hundred thousand; a reduction, as before stated, on the ordinary annual expenditure, of nearly two millions; and on the total expenditure of the two years compared, of ten millions. As respected the Ways and Means for raising this supply, six millions of it were raised from the usual ready money sources of government, the new duties, lottery, &c. and the remainder by a loan of thirteen millions from the Sinking Fund.

In the brief examination of this budget, consistent with this summary review of our finances, it affords two circumstances chiefly worthy of observation; the first, the reduction of nearly two millions from the supply taken for the preceding year; and the second, such a prosperous condition of public credit, and such a progressive amelioration in the state of the industrious part of the community, as enabled the Saving Banks of the country to pay one million yearly into the public funds.

Such, therefore, is the state of the question as respects the successive reductions effected by his Majesty's ministers. Upon a retrospect of what has been above stated, and for the sake of affording a simple and collective view of these reductions, they may be briefly enumerated as follows:—

First.—The total of the ordinary and extraordinary annual supply for 1816 (exclusive of the interest of the national debt and the charges on the Consolidated Fund) was twenty-seven millions. The total of the ordinary and extraordinary supply for 1817 was twenty-two millions. The total of the same supply for the year 1818 was twenty millions nine hundred thousand. The total of the same supply for the year 1819 was twenty millions four hundred thousand. The total of the same for 1820 was twenty millions seven hundred thousand. For 1821 the same was twenty millions.

Second.—The total of the ordinary expenditure (for army, navy, ordnance, and miscellaneous) for 1816 was twenty-four millions eight hundred and eighty-seven thousand pounds. The total for 1817 was twenty millions. The total for 1818 was a small excess above eighteen millions. The total for 1819 was nearly the same sum. The total for 1820 (including the estimated expense of the coronation) was a small excess above nineteen millions. The total for 1821 was eighteen millions. Being a reduction, in 1817, of five millions; in 1818, of two millions; in 1819, of the same; and a small addition having been made in 1820, under the two new circumstances of the expected coronation and the interruption of the public tranquillity by the practices of incendiary writers and speakers: this charge was thrown off in the following year, 1821, and a return effected to the reduced standard of 1818 and 1819.

Third.—This reduction was carried through every head of the ordinary annual supply. The supply for the army, for 1816, was, in round numbers, eleven millions. For 1817 the supply for the same service was nine millions four hundred thousand. For 1818 eight millions nine hundred thousand. For 1819 eight millions nine hundred thousand. For 1820 (under the new circumstance of an interruption in the public tranquillity by the causes which have been already stated) nine millions four hundred thousand. For 1821 eight millions seven hundred and fifty thousand—a return again to the reduced estimates of 1818 and 1819.

Fourth.—The same reduction was made in the naval supply. For 1816 the naval supply was ten millions. For 1817 the navy (including some extraordinaries upon making up the account of the year) cost seven millions. For 1818 six millions and a half. For 1819 the naval supply was six millions four hundred thousand. For 1820 six millions five hundred thousand and a fraction. For 1821 six millions one hundred thousand and a fraction.

Fifth.—The same successive reduction was effected in the ordnance. For 1816 the ordnance service was sixteen hundred thousand. For 1817 twelve hundred and seventy thousand. For 1818 twelve hundred and forty thousand. For 1819 eleven hundred and ninety thousand. For 1820 twelve hundred thousand. For 1821 eleven hundred and ninety thousand; being a return to the reduced estimates of the year 1819; the small addition in the preceding year being occasioned by the disturbed state of the country, by the same cause as the increase of the army, namely, the agitated condition of certain districts, and the employment of marines to perform garrison duty.

Sixth.—In the miscellaneous, allowing for the less proportion in which this head of service is affected by the difference of peace and war, a system of retrenchment is equally visible. For 1816 the miscellaneous was two millions and a half. For 1817 the same service was seventeen hundred thousand. For 1818 the same. For 1819 one million nine hundred thousand pounds. For 1820 (under the two new circumstances of the coronation and the derangement of the public peace) it was two millions four hundred thousand. In 1821 the supply was one million nine hundred thousand, being a return to the reduced estimate of the year 1819.

Seventh.—The same successive reduction was made in the number of men taken for the military and naval establishments through the several years. In the course of 1815 and 1816 three hundred thousand men were discharged from the army and navy. In 1816 the peace establishment for the home-service, Ireland, and the colonies, was fixed at ninety-nine thousand men. In 1817 this was reduced to ninety-two thousand. In 1818 it was reduced to eighty-one thousand. In 1819 it was again reduced to seventy-eight thousand.

Eighth.—And during these reductions more than sixteen millions of annual taxes were removed, and ten millions of the Bank debt paid.

Ninth.—And by these uniform efforts for reduction on the one part, and for the support of public credit on the other, the national currency was re-established, and cash-payments finally restored in the present year.

Nor have his Majesty's ministers stopped here, but, since the close of the last session, have still, with the same earnestness and sincerity, been occupied in such further reductions as the exigencies of the public service would admit. In a very few weeks after these observations shall meet the public eye, a detailed statement will, doubtless, be made in parliament, by which it will appear, that a further reduction of upwards of 1,500,000*l.* has been effected within the short interval between the close of the last session and the commencement of the ensuing. It is surely not too much to say, that this amount of reduction exceeds what could have been anticipated by the warmest friends of economy. It is another question, perhaps, whether in the degree of these retrenchments ministers have not pared away a little too near the quick, and whether some of them have not already been found to put into peril, and assuredly to augment the difficulty of a due and prompt administration of the public service. It is another question, whether some services might not have been more efficiently performed with larger means. It is another question, whether, in the prudence of government, as in the prudence of individual life, present cheapness is always the best economy; and whether energy and promptitude, in the application of public force to sudden tumults, be not well purchased by the difference of cost between a force of ready, and a force of tardy, application. All these points belong to a different view of the subject.

If it be conceded, as indeed it can no longer be denied,—that these several reductions have been made in the degree and manner above stated; but, if it be demanded, why were not these reductions made before? Have they not rather been extorted than given? Do not the public owe them rather to the vigilance of Opposition than to the free grace of his Majesty's ministers?—It may be very shortly answered, that they have been carried into effect at the first possible moment; and that the opponents of his Majesty's ministers have in no instance led the way to any practicable reductions in the establishments of the country. They have indeed fired at random into the midst of all of the public establishments; and, under the necessary effect of an aim, comprehending generally the whole covey, though they may possibly have hit the same birds, they are but little entitled to the praise of any direct intention or distinct object. By proposing to reduce all, they have so far fallen into concurrence with his Majesty's government in reducing some. But let these gentlemen in turn answer his Majesty's ministers this question—What would now have been the state of the country, if their proposed retrenchments had been carried into effect?

Ministers have not only reduced all that was possible, but at the first possible moment. At the end of no former war was the frame-work of our army so large and complicate, composed of so many members, and those members so remote in position and service. At the end of no former war had the soldiers and officers of our army and navy such claims upon the consideration of the community. At the end of no former war were such establishments to be reduced, and so many soldiers and sailors to be cast upon the agriculture of the country. An adverse political spirit was still fermenting throughout the population of the conquered colonies. The embers of civil discord were not extinct in France, and the principle of innovation was already at work in every part of Europe. The internal tranquillity of the country had been disturbed by factious artifices. Under all these circumstances, it was manifestly necessary to proceed cautiously and with measured steps in the reduction of our force. Some interval of time was further necessary to form a distinct view of what admitted of reduction in a force so widely dispersed. Even now it is only upon a view of the improved state of things, and under an expectation that the existing quiet of our manufacturing districts may continue undisturbed; that the country magistracy in particular, and the people in general, will concur with ministers in maintaining tranquillity; that ancient habits and feelings will return, and that manners will take the place of laws in closing the channels of the country against the contagion of the licentious press of the metropolis—it is only under these expectations, that even now his Majesty's ministers can justify themselves in the late reductions of our military force.

Our first proposition, under the head of the finance administration of his Majesty's ministers, was, that, from the year 1816 up to the present period, they have successively effected such reductions in the annual expenditure, as is consistent with the due efficiency of the public service. This being, as it is trusted, sufficiently proved, the order of the subject-matter now proceeds to the second position, namely, *That the main sources of national revenue and public wealth are, in their actual state, entire and unimpaired, and most fully justify a confidence for the present, and* *a strong expectation for the future.* This is the question for present examination.

In considering the sources of the country, the most obvious order appears to be to take the funds of production. The heads of these funds are the commerce, the navigation, the manufactures, the internal trade, and (so far as respects the interests of the revenue, and as affording proof that the general means of consuming are unimpaired) the national consumption. A very brief and general view of our national sources in these their main channels will afford the most satisfactory answer to the proposition under consideration.

Under the head of commerce, the first point is—the comparative state of imports through the successive years from 1817 downwards. Now as regards the bearing of the amount of imports upon the question of our national resources, these imports naturally distribute themselves under the three classes—the first, the imports connected more immediately with manufactures and foreign trade than with the consumption of the country; and therein by their increase or decrease affording an unequivocal proof of the growth of that trade and manufacture of which they form the materials. The second, imports in part consumed, and in part affording materials of foreign trade. The third, the imports entirely consumed.

The principal imports of the first class are flax, hemp, raw and thrown silk, and cotton. It is not our purpose to exhaust the patience of our readers by exhibiting the columns of figures under these several heads. So far as respects the point in question, namely, the integrity of all the funds of produce, the result of this comparison may be shown in a few sentences. In 1817, the official value of flax and hemp, the materials of our linen manufacture of all kinds, and therefore a more just criterion of the state of these manufactures than the quantity of the manufactured article, was in round figures 700,000*l.* In 1821, the official value of the same articles was one million two hundred thousand pounds. In raw silk, (an article of the first consequence, inasmuch as it is the material of a manufacture now about to become one of the staples of the kingdom, and to push aside its former rivals, the silks of Italy and Lyons) the state of our imports through the above successive years has been equally promising. Without going through the minute detail of figures, it will be sufficient to add, that, from 1816 to 1822, the amount of raw and thrown silk imported has increased from about half a million to nearly a million and a half; that is, to three times its former amount. This increase of importation is of so much the more consequence, inasmuch, as above said, it is the increase of a manufacture now rising amongst us from its former subordinate state, to the condition of one of our staples. In cotton, the comparative state of our imports is equally promising. Within the same period of years, our importation of cotton, now the leading manufacture of the kingdom, and destined doubtless to become the clothing of the world, has increased from three millions to five, and in the year now about closing, (1821) will exceed six millions. Thus, in these three main articles of our manufactures, our cotton, silk, and linen staples, the first has nearly doubled itself, within about five years; the second has trebled itself, and the last, in despite of the competition of the German manufacturers, and their peculiar facilities of supplying the continent by their internal navigation, has likewise nearly doubled in amount.

Of the imports in part consumed, and in part affording articles of foreign trade, the principle are, sugar, rum, tea, and tobacco. Under all these heads there has been an increase in the importation, except as compared with those years of extraordinary produce of the revenue, when the war expenditure was at such an unexampled height, and the spirit of speculation, bursting forth with the peace, carried the trade of the country so far above its ordinary level. From 1817 to the present time, our importation of sugar has increased from three millions and a half cwts. to four. The official value of the imporation in 1821 was five millions and half, a sum equal to the best year of the war. The importation of rum exhibits a still more flattering increase. From 1817 to 1821 the importation of rum has nearly doubled; in the former year the value being 348,000*l.* and in the latter 618,000*l.* In tea, our import has obtained a steady augmentation within the same period by nearly the amount of two millions of lbs. in quantity, and exceeds the average of the war consumption by nearly one million in official value. The import of tobacco has greatly increased from 1817 up to the present time. In all these articles, therefore, having this mixed character of home-consumption and the materials of foreign trade, there has been this large increase within the last five years of the peace.

Of imports entirely consumed by ourselves, and consisting of an infinite number of small articles, the general result will be best exhibited by the gradual increase in the customs and excise upon these imports. Suffice it to observe, that, throughout all these articles, there has been an increase proportionate to their several amounts; which, though too small upon each article singly to justify a separate statement, ascends, upon the whole, to an increase of at least two millions upon almost any year of the war.

The principal exports connected with the sources of our national prosperity are our cotton, woollen, linen, and silk manufactures;

our iron and steel work; our tin, pewter, and plated goods; glass, and refined sugar. To which may be added, our colonial exports of coffee, rum, sugar, indigo, and India piece goods.

Under all these heads, it will be seen that our funds of commerce and industry exist in the same vigor and integrity as during the war. From 1817 to 1821, the value of our cotton manufactures, exported, rose from sixteen millions to twenty-one millions. But in no year of the war had the value of these exports exceeded eighteen millions. When the accounts shall be made up for the year now current, namely, to January 1822, the value of our cotton exports will be found to exceed twenty-three millions; such at least is the promise of the quarter now current. Under this head, therefore, which in value exceeds one half of the total amount of all our exports of British manufacture, the resources of the country are not only entire, but exceed, by nearly one-fourth, the average of the last three years of the war.

Our next manufacture is our woollen. The average value of this export during the war was between five and six millions annually. Under the effect of the foreign wool-tax, the value of the same export, in the year 1821, was reduced to four millions and three quarters. In the year now closing it will much exceed five millions. Our linen manufactures have risen, between 1817 and 1821, from one million and a half to two millions, being double the amount of the same exports during either of the three last years of the war, 1811, 1812, and 1813. Our exports in silk, though as to exports only an incipient manufacture, have gradually become in annual real value half a million, about one-fourth the amount of our linen exports. Our exports of iron and steel, wrought and unwrought, in the year 1821, maintain their average produce during the war, and in January 1822 will exceed the export of any former year. From 1817 to the year 1821 our exports of refined sugar have increased from a million and a half to two millions, and have nearly doubled their amount in any year of the war. It would lead into a detail too minute to follow the comparative produce through the remaining articles in the long list of our exports. Suffice it to say, that they all exhibit the same aspect of unimpaired energy, and, from the promise of the current and commencing years, justify a strong expectation, that they are no longer vibrating between a high amount in one year and a diminishing rate in the following. Our tin, pewter, and plated goods, exceed, together, half a million in annual value, and exhibit an increase of nearly one half of their total amount above the war years of 1811, 1812, and 1813.

In colonial exports, sugar, rum, coffee, indigo, tobacco, and India piece goods, our exports in almost all cases equal their average amount during the three war years 1811, 1812, and 1813, and in many articles exceed double the average amount of a war year, as in rum and indigo; the average war export of rum being in value half a million only, and in the year 1821 upwards of eleven hundred thousand pounds. The same of indigo; the average war export, in 1811, 1812, and 1813, being of the value of 400,000*l.* only, whilst the exports of 1821 exceeded in value eight hundred thousand.

Nor has the average of our sugar exports declined from its amount during the war years above stated; a most important fact, when it is considered that, during the war, nearly all the sugar colonies in the world were our own. Another fact, and of most important bearing upon the question under consideration, should be retained in memory during the comparison of these two periods. Under the depreciation of all articles from the conclusion of the war to the present period, it is manifest that the same sums no longer represent the same quantities of goods, and, therefore, that the equality of value in the averages of the two periods is necessarily a proof of a great increase in the present time. Suffice it to add, in conclusion of this part of our subject, that our average exports of tobacco have nearly doubled their amount since the war; and that the average value of our India piece goods, exported, is gradually advancing from its amount of one million during the war, to a million and a quarter. Such is the present condition of our national resources as regards the question of our foreign and colonial exports.

Under the head of navigation, the entirety of our resources may be very briefly exhibited in its four usual divisions—of vessels built, vessels registered, outward tonnage, and inward tonnage. Of vessels annually built, the average of the three last years of the war was seven hundred and sixty vessels. The average of the years since the peace has been one thousand vessels. Of the total tonnage of vessels registered, the average, during the war, was two millions and less than a half. The average of peace very nearly reaches two millions and three quarters. The average outward tonnage of vessels was, during the war, about one million and three quarters. The same average, during the last three years, has exceeded two millions. The average of inward tonnage was, during the war, about eighteen hundred thousand tons. The same average, during the last three years, has exceeded two millions and a quarter. Such is the brief exposition of the state of our national sources as regards our navigation.

Before quitting this part of our subject, it is an act of justice to his Majesty's ministers to remind the country, that under no former administration has so much been conceded to the commercial interest of the empire. If ministers have not gone the full speculative length of those gentlemen, who in pamphlets and reviews out of parliament, and in speeches and essays within it (very commendable from their length and labor), have recommended the general adoption of all the theories of Smith and Turgot they must not be denied in the first instance, the praise of having listened to these speeches with a patience as commendable as the industry of the speakers; and in the next, of having supported, and personally attended, the appointment of the parliamentary committees for which they have asked. If these committees have, in most instances, had no other termination than in the publication of a long report, the cause is, doubtless, to be sought in the difficulty of the subject, and in the wide difference between theory and practice—between diagrams of navigation upon dry land, and practical courses rendered necessary by sea and winds. It is not requisite to inform his Majesty's ministers that the first and best principles of commerce would be a perfect freedom of trade, and that in almost all cases legislators would act wisely in leaving it to find its own way. The same text-books were open for them as for their political adversaries. It was as easy for them, upon a petition from Manchester or Birmingham, to give a laborious summary of the three volumes of the Wealth of Nations. It was as easy for them to refer all national principles to the language of the exchange and the bullion-market. But, having been educated in another school, they have learned that a nation has other interests besides those of money-making. They have learned that the first interest of the empire is in its national defence, and in the maintenance, in their full integrity, of those funds of our maritime greatness and revenue, under which we have attained our actual condition. They perceive, moreover, that an absolute liberty of trade can exist beneficially for us, only by becoming a general system; for if one nation should abolish all its duties and restraints, whilst all other nations should retain them, the former will only sacrifice its revenue, and reduce all the sources of its national power, in order to strengthen and enrich the latter. Under these two controlling principles, his Majesty's ministers have indeed deemed it prudent to retain the navigation-laws of the kingdom, and to touch with great caution and delicacy a commercial system, under which the general commerce of Great Britian exceeds the collective amount of the trade of all the nations in the world.

But will it be asserted for a moment that nothing has been done by ministers, and by the system upon which they act, when it is recollected, that to this system the country is indebted for the opening of the trade to India? Has nothing been done for the colonial trade, and for British commerce in general, by the several acts of the 52, 53, 54, and 57th of George the Third? Is it no relaxation from the ancient errors, as they are termed, of our colonial system, that, through the medium of free ports, nearly the whole exports of our colonies are open for the supply of the United States? Is it no departure from our ancient rigid monopoly, that American vessels, and the vessels of European powers, may now trade directly with India, and that by a very recent act, the British private trade to the East Indies may now seek a general market? Is it nothing, that of all the ancient monopolies by companies, the most impolitic, doubtless, of all monopolies, one only now exists, and that company so divested of its exclusive powers, as nearly to reduce it, as respects general commerce, to an open trade.

Will the political economists themselves refuse praise to his Majesty's ministers upon their own principles, when it shall be brought to their recollection, that in a time of much difficulty they bought up the monopoly of the South Sea Company, and opened that large portion of the sea to general trade? Is it necessary to inform the patient and laborious lawyers of that party, how much litigation, and, in many instances, how many hardships to merchants were occasioned by these exclusive privileges of the South Sea Company, which were all abolished by the 55th of George the Third? And, to conclude this part of our subject upon the present occasion, has nothing been done by the abolition in many cases, and the reduction in still more, of the system of bounties, which, in the last century, pressed so uselessly on the produce of the customs? Assuredly, the merchants and traders of Great Britain will not refuse their tribute of gratitude to his Majesty's ministers, when they shall be reminded of those two most beneficial statutes, the 51st and the 54th of George the Third, by which the ancient fiscal rigor, respecting the seizure and forfeiture of ships for breaches of the revenue and navigation laws, has been so considerably relaxed, and a prompt and efficient remedy afforded to those hard circumstances so frequently occurring under them.

One further observation before this division closes. Looking to our navigation, trade, and commerce, under the two main heads of imports and exports, it has above been made manifest, that the average of the years of peace, reckoning from 1817 to 1821, far exceeds those of the three last years of the war, 1811, 1812, and 1813. In 1812 and 1813, both years of considerable trade, the value of our imports did not reach thirty millions; whilst the exports of those years, comprising British manufactures and foreign merchandize, did not exceed, in the most favorable of the three, forty-six millions. Now, in the year ending January 5th, 1821, the value of our imports exceeded thirty-six millions and a half, and our exports fell little short of fifty-two millions. In this account, the year ending January 5th, 1814, is omitted, as the documents have been destroyed by the fire at the Custom-house; and the years 1815 and 1816 ought not to be taken as standards. They were years of unparalleled speculation in imports and exports, arising from the sudden opening of the markets of the world, and therein formed an extraordinary state of circumstances which of course disqualify them from becoming examples of the ordinary progress of trade.

As such is the state of the question, as regards our general commerce, the internal trade of the country exhibits an aspect equally promising. Amongst the ingenious writers of the present day, there has been much discussion respecting the comparative value of our home and foreign trade. According to some of these writers we are in every respect sufficient for ourselves; and the industry, and even the wealth of the country, would be but little affected, if we withdrew as much as possible from commercial intercourse with foreigners. According to others, and those the most numerous, we exist only by our foreign trade; and our national prosperity is to be regarded as rising or declining, in the proportion in which our foreign trade increases or diminishes. As usually happens in questions of this kind, both sides are in the extreme. Considering not only the number of our population, but its habits and ability of consuming, it is perhaps not too much to assert, that the consumption of the British empire, of all articles, except only bread-corn and the necessaries of life, exceeds that of the whole continent of Europe. If this be true, and it is of easy proof, the supply of this consumption, upon the mere point of its magnitude, must necessarily be of much greater importance than our foreign commerce. This consideration of the question is further confirmed by the comparative sums contributed to the revenue by our foreign and internal trade. Of the fifty-six millions composing our annual revenue, not one-fifth of the whole is paid by the customs, and of course more than four-fifths by the excise, and other duties on use, possession, and consumption. Of so much consequence is it to our national welfare that all our funds of trade and industry should remain entire.

The principal subject-matter of internal trade is necessarily in our four principal manufactures, cotton, wool, linen, and silk; in our iron, tin, and copper works; in our glass, leather, printed goods, salt, soap, and candles; to which, as regards consumption and revenue, may be added, sugar, tea, wine, malt, and British and foreign spirits. It is not our purpose to follow the annual produce of these several articles in minute detail; a very few words upon one or more of them collectively will show, that the annual quantity of these articles which the country consumes, and the working up, or dealing in which, affords employment to seven parts out of ten of our population, is higher than in any average year of the war, and that, since the peace, they have all either absolutely increased, or maintained a high average rate.

It has often been lamented by political writers, that more satisfactory registers are not kept of the produce of our cotton and woollen manufactures. From the defect of all official records upon this subject, the state of these manufactures can only be collected either from the local vouchers of one or two districts, or from general observation of what is passing before the eyes of all of us. Enough, however, appears upon both these grounds to justify the assertion, that our cotton and woollen manufactures are rapidly rising to a state of unexampled prosperity. The activity of the woollen manufactures in Yorkshire, during the last half year, has never been known to be greater. This appears from the accounts of the quantity of manufactured cloth, exhibited at the quarter sessions for the West Riding. The increase of the import of the raw material may afford a just measure of the increased manufacture. It has been stated in a former part of these observations, that, from 1817 only to the present time, our import of cotton wool has nearly doubled, having risen in that time from three millions to five. It is the same with flax and hemp, the raw materials of our linen, the value of the import of raw flax having augmented from four hundred thousand to eight. It is the same with our silk manufactures, the importation of the raw material having risen, from 1817 to the present time, from six hundred thousand pounds in value to nearly one million and a half: and what is perhaps of more importance, having so prodigiously advanced as to outstrip the manufactures of Lyons and Italy. The improved style of dress of the great majority of the people, is an unanswerable argument of the vast increase of muslins and calicoes. If it be here objected, that against this augmentation of the supply, we must set off the reduction in the price, it may be answered, that the increase of manufactures does not occasion a glut or mischievous excess, so long as the demand continues with the increase, and so long as the manufacture can be carried on with profit. But the present active employment of all hands shows that such is the actual state of our manufactures. Under such circumstances, the reduction of price is proof only of the abundance of the article, and of the skill and industry with which it is worked up. If it be admitted that the total amount of what is now manufactured does not exceed in pecuniary value the less quantity which we worked up during the war, the country still possesses the same total value, and gains in the increased comfort and abundance in which every individual in the country is supplied.

As regards our silk manufactures in particular, it is not too much to say, that the country in general is not sufficiently sensible of their value and importance, and of the astonishing growth to which they have attained during the short period of ten or twelve years. This is a manufacture in a great degree foreign to us, and entirely taken from our neighbours; and having attained to its present state in so short an interval, it is not too much to anticipate such a further improvement, and such a consequent reduction of price, as may greatly extend the consumption of this article, not only amongst ourselves, but amongst foreigners. But upon this trade the country is already in possession of the report by the committee of the House of Lords. It was in the same manner that, from small beginnings, our cotton manufacture has excluded that of all nations of the world; and that the fine muslins and cambrics of Manchester, Glasgow, and Paisley, have driven those of France and India nearly out of the market.

As respects our domestic consumption, our printed goods are next in consequence. Here we get to the undoubted authority of official documents, and of those which can least be suspected, the accounts of money received upon them at the Excise. Here we have indisputable proof of the vast increase of the manufacture. Within seven years only, from 1813 to 1821, the annual excise upon this manufacture has risen from less than a million to nearly a million and a half; the amount paid in 1813 being about nine hundred thousand pounds, whilst in 1820 it was nearly a million and a half. It is scarcely necessary to observe, that seven-tenths of this species of manufacture is consumed entirely at home, and is the clothing of a great majority of our female population; and that the large consumption of it is, therefore, at once a proof of the prosperity of the manufacture, and of the continued ability of the consumers.

If the depression of price have been one of the causes of this increased consumption, the continuance of the manufacture from year to year is still a proof that the article can be yet made with profit; whilst as above said, the cheapness, or in other words, the abundance, is but so much added to the comfort and substance of the people. If national opulence, like individual, consists only in the abundant possession of whatever renders life easy and comfortable, surely it is no inconsiderable addition to our general wealth, that so large a proportion of our population is so well and so sufficiently clothed. Is it possible, indeed, to pay a weekly visit to our country churches, and yet refuse to recognize the vast superiority of our laboring poor, in the quality and cleanliness of their clothing, above those of the continental nations? In answer, indeed, to any complaints of declining manufactures, is it necessary to say more than to refer the reader to his own observation? But as public wealth consists in the abundance itself, and not in current prices—as a manufacture, like a mine, is to be considered the richest, which pours forth the most plentiful produce—and as the integrity of the funds of growth is of infinitely more consequence, than the incidental price of their supply in a pecuniary market, it is unnecessary to urge further proof, that, as respects our manufactures at least, the resources of the country are unimpaired; that all the same funds continue, and that almost all yield, not the same, but an increased supply; that the cheapness of price enables more persons to buy, and all persons to use more plentifully; that the consumption of the manufacture thus passes into classes, from which higher prices had excluded it, and, whilst the manufacturer himself loses nothing, inasmuch as he gains the same profit upon a larger stock, the condition of every individual in the country is improved, by obtaining either what he had not before, or by having it in more abundance. If our manufacturers have not a continental monopoly, as during some years of the war, it can no longer be a question, whether they are not more than compensated by the increased demand at home. High prices and large profits do not necessarily constitute the prosperity of trade, and assuredly do not compose the prosperity of a nation. It is the interest of a paternal government, that the largest possible proportion of its whole population should be enabled to reach the comforts and decencies of life; and this can never happen in any extent but under larger supplies and low prices. The poorest nation in the world, the Spanish empire, made the highest profits upon the amount of its trade, and with no other national benefit, than that a few merchants and companies were enriched at the general expense. Of so little importance, in a national point of view, is the reduction of the profits of trade, or rather the depression of prices.

If it could be expected that the reader would go through these statements without weariness, it might be easy to carry the same comparison through the long details of our domestic consumption, and to exhibit the same advantage of increase through all those heads and articles which peculiarly belong to our internal trade and intercourse. In that portion of our stamp-duties which belongs to the degree and number of our domestic dealings and exchanges, and which is therefore a just measure of any increase or diminution; in assessed taxes upon windows and inhabited houses, any augmentation of which can only arise from the continual employment of capital in building and improving; in the post-horse and stage-coach duties, which necessarily measure the degree of intercourse between town and town;—under all these heads the official reports of finance can only lead to the same conclusion, that the resources of the internal trade of the country are not only unimpaired, but are all existing in increased energy.

A very brief view of the quarters just terminated will confirm the above proposition, and conclude this division of our subject. The first quarter of this year ended, of course, April 5th. Now, for the sake of exhibiting a fair comparison of the two years, let us for a moment assume the two financial years, 1820 and 1821, to have terminated respectively on that day. The increase of the revenue of the latter year would then exhibit a sum of nearly two millions. The increase on the excise alone would appear to be two millions and a half, and this increase attaching on general consumption; on candles, coffee, hops, malt, pepper, printed goods, salt, soap, British spirits, tea, tobacco, and snuff. But if this quarter were thus favorable, the October quarter now past exhibits an augmentation of revenue without parallel. Under all the heads of the consolidated fund, the customs, excise, stamps, and assessed taxes, there was a large excess above the corresponding quarter of the preceding year. In the total war taxes there is an excess of 500,000*l.*, beyond the corresponding quarter of the last year; and in the total revenue, the excess, as compared with the same quarter, is between 8 and 900,000*l.* Under the excise, all the great articles of consumption have increased, and this augmentation has pervaded almost every head of the consolidated excise duties. The total was astonishing. It exhibited an increase over the October quarter of 1818 of a sum above 700,000*l.*; over the like quarter of 1819 of above 1,800,000*l.*; and over the corresponding quarter of 1820 of 857,000*l.* Nor is there any just cause of apprehension that this prosperity is merely transient. At the time these observations are writing, there is confident reason to expect that there will be a considerable rise in the customs, and, so far as the payments from week to week have been made from the collectors of excise, they justify the expectation that the total produce will be equal to the receipt of the corresponding period of the last year.[1] But it is surely not necessary to argue, that occasional vibrations between a higher and a lower degree, from causes so entirely incidental as insufficient harvests and unfavorable seasons, are not to be carried to the discredit of the general character of our financial resources. The question is, what is our general condition, and not what is our particular suffering under a cause manifestly temporary. As a nation, like an individual, consumes perhaps under the same general circumstances about the same quantity, one year with another, it would be sufficient for our present purpose to show that our general consumption has not declined.

---

[1] Since the publication of the first edition of this work, the quarter has closed with an increase of more than 400,000*l.* above the corresponding quarter of last year.

Such is the general condition of the resources of the country, as respects the four great members which compose the fund of public wealth, our commerce, navigation, manufactures, and internal trade. An objection may here probably be made, whether a fifth and most important member, our agriculture, does not remain behind, and whether the condition of that element of national strength be equally prosperous with those above-mentioned. To this it might be answered, in the first instance, that we should carry in our minds a distinction before taken between the integrity of the fund of production itself, and the pecuniary price of its produce in the market. Every fund of production, whether a mine, a meadow, a tree, the soil of the earth, or a manufacture, is in a more or less prosperous state, and is more or less rich at one period than another, according as its actual produce has increased or diminished—according as it produces more or less of its natural fruit and subject of growth. But if this principle be applied to our agriculture, will it be contended, that the productive powers of the soil are impaired, and that the proportion in natural produce of what is sown and what is reaped has become diminished? It is perfectly true, that, from a multitude of causes, some of them obvious and distinct, and others more remote and complicate, many of them still in operation, and others which have certainly exhausted their effect—our landlords and farmers have suffered much from the depression of the markets; and that the price of land in rent, and the price of its produce in the market, have rapidly fallen from their rate during the war. The causes of this depression have been examined at length by a parliamentary committee, and the conclusion to which the report conducts the reader agrees with the inference previously deduced by every one acquainted with the principles of political economy. As the committee was honored by the attendance of several of those gentlemen, who in the present day particularly profess to advocate those principles, and who indeed chiefly censure his Majesty's ministers for not adopting their sentiments to the full extent in which they themselves advocate them, we would wish to put it to their candor, whether, according to every just maxim of political economy, the present state of the corn-market can be any thing but temporary; and whether it be in the nature of things, that the general price of the materials of human sustenance can fall short of the cost of producing them. It is totally impossible that the present state of the markets can continue, or that agriculture, like manufactures, should not accommodate itself to a new state of things, and therein resume a condition, under which it may be conducted with due profits to all concerned. One of the heaviest burdens upon agriculture, the poor-rates, is diminishing in every part of the kingdom; in many parts a half, and in all a fourth. The continuance of peace, and the proceeding improvement of our finances, added to the zeal and sincerity with which ministers are making retrenchments, will gradually relieve the landlord and farmer, whilst the advancing state of manufactures will both increase the demand for agricultural produce, and assist in the further reduction of the poor-rates. If the rent of land and the price of its produce, have diminished with the cessation of the war, so likewise have the price and stock of manufacturers and merchants. It is notorious, that the accumulated stocks of our merchants and manufacturers have diminished at least thirty per cent.; and that a capitalist, who, ten years since, was worth twenty thousand pounds, in the value of his stock on hand, is now not worth fourteen; or to adopt the popular term, has suffered the extinction of a third part of his fortune. These are the incidents of the two periods of war and peace, and are common to all classes, as well as to the landlord and farmer. The main and sole question is, whether the fund of growth and profit be safe and unimpaired? Is there the same proportion between the seed and the harvest? Must the article continue in demand, or is the demand gone altogether? If it must be had, it must be paid for. To say all in a word, and to conclude this part of our subject, it is totally impossible that the ordinary and general price of food should not command the price of the land which rises it, of the laborer who sows and reaps it, and of the farmer who affords the capital and current expense of its cultivation from day to day. For a single year, or even for three successive years, a large surplus, beyond the demand of consumption, will not only be so much not wanted in itself, and, therefore, in itself, of little price in the market, but will necessarily affect the price of the whole quantity. But when waste, or what always accompanies the low price of food, a more plentiful use, shall have consumed the surplus quantity; or when the quantity grown shall have adapted itself to the supply, if the quantity actually grown be too much, all these incidental irregularities will pass away, and farmers and landlords will obtain the prices to which they are entitled.

As regards the general state of our debt and the means of redeeming it, it will appear by the accounts of the year now closing, that ministers will have proceeded with all practicable expedition to accomplish the recommendation of the finance committee of 1819. By the effect of a most zealous retrenchment, and by the proceeding improvement of our national resources, they would have attained in 1822 a surplus of five millions, to be employed as a permanent sinking fund upon the national debt, if the agricultural horse tax of half a million had not been repealed. If Mr. Pitt, in the year 1786, regarded a sinking fund of one million to be adequate to the redemption of a debt of two hundred and forty millions, it is manifest that a sinking fund of five millions would operate with nearly a twofold proportion upon a debt of eight hundred millions. It would have the air of a paradox to assert, that a speedier redemption of the debt would not be desirable. But it may assuredly be stated, that in the actual condition of the country a larger sinking fund can in no degree be afforded. The immediate conclusion of a long war is not the most favorable period for the redemption of a national debt. If, together with the success of the ministers in creating this sinking fund, it be borne in mind, that they have within the same period paid a debt to the Bank of ten millions, and have not only themselves foregone any facility from a paper-currency in administering the powers of government, but have urged and enabled the Bank to resume cash-payments, it will be admitted, that, under the difficulties of the times, and the conclusion of so long a war, they have accomplished as much as could reasonably be expected. It may now be confidently asserted, that the system of loans and new taxes has reached its termination; that we are now living upon our income, and are in a condition of redeeming yearly some part of a mortgage which undoubtedly presses heavily upon the industry of the people. Under the system of loans we should every year have borrowed upon less favorable terms; and what is equally worthy of consideration, we should have anticipated in peace the resources of war. We should have gone to any new war under a most extreme difficulty; or, like France, under the administration of Fleury, we should have lost our due consideration in Europe, by seeking peace at more than its due value. By the application of the old sinking fund to the expenditure of the country, but still leaving a surplus of between four and five millions above our expenditure to operate upon the debt, we secure a great present relief, and leave untouched the means of future defence.

FOREIGN RELATIONS.

Without going into a detail of the new system upon which Europe was settled at the period of the treaties, it may be sufficient to state, that the European commonwealth was reconstructed at this period chiefly upon three principles.

The first was, that there should be such a distribution of power among the several principal states, as might render each sufficient in itself to maintain its independence, and to withstand any possible incursion of France, till the general confederacy of Europe could move up in defence of the common tranquillity.

Secondly, but always subservient to the first principle, the restoration of ancient powers to their former stateof possession.

Thirdly, where such restoration was manifestly impossible, or where it seemed expedient to forego it, in pursuit of the more valuable object of rendering each state sufficient to its own defence, in such case to indemnify the suffering power for its lost territories from the common fund of conquest.

The system of Europe was accordingly settled upon these principles. Under the first of them, the kingdom of the Netherlands was erected, and was rendered compact and self-sufficient, by its annexation to the United Provinces. And, as the Netherlands were thus interposed as a barrier between France and Germany, Sardinia, by the annexation of Genoa, was rendered a more adequate barrier between France and Italy. Under the second principle, the Swiss Republics and Italian states were restored as nearly as possible to their ancient condition. Under the third, Austria received an indemnity in Italy; whilst Prussia, who was in some degree affected by the new changes, and who lost her ancient influence in Holland, received a portion of Saxony.—This last modification was indeed further recommended by the new state of things in Germany, and by the extinction, during the wars of the French revolution, of the German Empire. Under these circumstances, there was no longer any power in Germany sufficiently compact and united to oppose an adequate defensive force against a sudden invasion. Experience had proved that Prussia in her actual state was no equal opponent to France, and that the exposed condition of the smaller principalities, and their compulsory submission to an invading army, necessarily threw them as increments into the hands of the invader. Nor is it necessary to conceal, that it had become expedient, upon many other considerations, to bestow this increase of territory upon Prussia, and to take it from Saxony. If the one had suffered more than any other power in Europe, under the long and unsparing oppression of France, the other, to use no harsher term, was surely but little entitled to escape the penalty of a war, in which her prince had borne so prominent a part.

As such is the new system upon which Europe is now settled, our duties, under our foreign relations, consist in little more than in a faithful observance of the spirit of the treaties upon which this system is grounded. The leading principle and object of these treaties, and of the condition which they constitute, are the maintenance of the general peace of Europe by the personal amity of the sovereigns, and by a system of mediation, which should, on the one side, recognize the perfect independence of the several states in their own internal concerns; and, upon the other, should hold forth their common interest, and therein their common obligation, to consult the general policy of Europe in all questions affecting the safety of the whole.

It is a malicious and most unjust representation of the character of this system to assert, that the allied powers, and England amongst them, are bound by these treaties to control the internal concerns of other states, or even to act the arbitrator in dissensions between state and state upon interests belonging only to themselves. As regards England, the obligations of the treaties are expressed in the treaties, and our contract is known to the letter. If the ministers of some of the allied powers appear to have pressed the assertion of this right of friendly mediation into that of authoritative control, the excess belongs only to them, and no portion of it attaches to us. They find nothing of this principle in the general treaties; and accordingly the king and government of England do not admit that they are comprehended in the obligation. If the assertion of these pretensions exist at all, it is totally a separate concern of the powers that make them. But it is not perhaps too much to say, that the Holy Alliance of the present time, like the treaty of Pilnitz in the French revolution, has no other existence, at least in the degree asserted, than in the factious writings of the day.

A very few words will explain intelligibly our different relations, and the good faith with which we adhere to the spirit of the peace. If we follow them geographically, our first relation is with Portugal, an ancient ally of the British crown, and one the most immediately indebted to us in the late war for deliverance and safety.

Under the ancient system of Europe, the object of our alliance with Portugal was to counterpoise the power of the House of Bourbon. Under the former close union of the two crowns of France and Spain, the common object of jealousy to Portugul and England was necessarily France and Spain; and the natural support of Portugal, a secondary state confiding upon a powerful neighbour, was England. In the vicissitude of human affairs, the original reasons for this alliance have passed away; but in the opening of the Brazils to British commerce, a new state of things has arisen, which may render it very doubtful, and till lately much more so, whether our close connection with Portugal be not our best policy. There can be no doubt that a commercial connection with France would be more lucrative, as to a pecuniary result, than with Portugal; and, if commerce were the only question, it would be an erroneous policy to adopt a minor state in preference to a principal. But as the maintenance of the political relations of Europe and Great Britain is an end of greater value and importance, it is a rule of sound prudence to consult the more valuable object, though with some sacrifice of the secondary one. Recent events, indeed, may render this relation of more problematical value. These events have not, however, as yet assumed a shape sufficiently determinate to justify further remarks. As regards the present question it is sufficient to observe, that the actual state of Portugal at the present period is another proof of the good faith and moderation of the British government. It can scarcely be doubted, that a monarch in the situation of the king of Portugal should not have made some friendly representation of the difficulties of his condition to the king and government of Great Britain. It is scarcely possible, that the king of England and the other allied sovereigns can have regarded without some feeling the recent proceeding amongst the Portuguese populace. It is equally impossible for the people of England not to feel some indignation at the unworthy levity, to use no other term, with which Portugal has forgotten the blood and treasure of England lavished in her defence. But, under all these circumstances, Portugal is still left to the administration of her own concerns. She is still left to work her way through her own anarchy. There is still encouragement to hope that the fire may burn out without reaching the walls of her neighbours. It remains to be seen, how far the event may justify this expectation; but in the mean time her actual condition may be assumed as no less a proof of the moderation of England, than of the true spirit of the treaties. For, under such a state of circumstances, what becomes of the alleged secret article, that all the kings of Europe should guarantee to each other the actual state of the monarchical power of each over his own subjects? Will it admit a doubt, that, under the projected constitutions of Spain and Portugal, the kings of those countries will possess a much less degree of sovereign power, and a much more arduous administration of their duties as heads of their states, than the former Stadtholder of Holland or the President of America.?

Our next foreign relation, following the same local order, is with Spain.—Here our moderation has been equally tried, both as regards our own peculiar gain, and as bears upon the alleged principle of defending kings at all events. In the contest between Spain and her colonies, we have held forth a different example from the former conduct of that crown between ourselves and America. It will not be denied that a strong temptation urged us. The emancipation of so large a customer could not but be most advantageous to so large a dealer as Great Britain. The free commerce with South America is nothing to other kingdoms in proportion to what it will eventually become to England. If our interest were strong, the impotence of the power to be injured (it is said without any purpose of offence) opened every thing to our mercy. There was no restraint but in our own generosity and justice. But this restraint was sufficient. We remembered that if honesty be the best policy of individuals, who are but creatures of the day; still more so is it the best wisdom of those more durable moral persons, the *κτήματα εἰς ἀεὶ*, states and empires. Under these feelings the South Americans were left to fight alone. Under these feelings the gentlemen of the English Opposition have taunted, and the British manufacturers have supplicated in vain. The answer of his Majesty's ministers to the one has been, that the faith of treaties was with them something more than a word of course; and that the weakness of a friendly power only superadded a duty of generosity to a duty of justice. To the other party they answered, that a nation had other interests besides present gain; and that if commerce be a good thing, national honor is a better.

It was under these principles that the Foreign Enlistment Bill was passed, and that our officers and soldiers were prohibited from entering into the service of the insurgent subjects of a friendly state. In the treaty signed at Madrid in 1814, it was stipulated between the governments of Spain and Great Britain, that, in performance of the duties of friendly states towards each other, his Britannic Majesty should prohibit his subjects from furnishing arms to the insurgent colonies of South America. It was manifestly within the obligations of friendly states, and the acknowledged public law of Europe, that the one power should require this engagement, and that the other should accede to it; the South American colonies being at the time a component portion of the Spanish empire, and the demand of Spain being nothing more than a stipulation that we should not interfere in the war between her colonies and herself. As it was therefore a matter of course in the British Government to make this engagement, so it was a point of good faith to give it an effectual observance. The Foreign Enlistment Bill was but the execution of this article of the treaty of Madrid. The treaty was merely declaratory of a pre-existing duty, and neither the article nor its performance gave any thing to Spain to which she had not a previous and perfect right. Under the public law of Europe, our actual relations with Spain and South America afforded us only the choice of two courses—either that of giving positive aid to the mother-country, or of remaining in a perfect neutrality. As either of these courses was open to us, just views of our own policy decided the choice, and we adopted, as we had good right to adopt, the part of neutrality. So far only we were at liberty to consult our own peculiar interests; for though the law of nations would admit us to afford positive aid to Spain, in the reduction of her colonies, the same law prohibited us, as contrary to the duty of friendly states, from giving any assistance to the colonies. Our conduct towards South America, from the peace to the present day, has been in conformity with these principles. With the strongest interest for assisting the colonies, in the face of the taunts of the Opposition, and against the clamors of our traders, his Majesty's ministers have steadily adhered to the obligations of public law, and to the faith of treaties. Nor have we satisfied ourselves with a merely apparent observance of this neutral conduct. We have acted throughout as becomes the direct and high-minded character of the country. We have sent no expedition to examine the respective strength of the two belligerent parties; we have held forth no encouragement to a persevering warfare by the expectation, that a certain degree of success only was wanting to ensure our recognition and co-operation. Our language to Spain has been—You have a right to require our neutrality, and therefore we engage for it; we have, indeed, a strong interest to decline such an engagement, but we have a manifest duty to make it. To the colonies we have said—We cannot aid you, but we will stand apart. To both we have fulfilled our duties and compact.

It is impossible upon this part of our subject, and with a view to events about closing as these observations are written, not to congratulate the country upon the full and unequivocal success of this part of our foreign policy; by which, with safe and unimpeached honor, and against the most urgent temptations, the course of human events has at length opened this commercial field to the full extent of our possible wishes. There can be no disposition in his Majesty's ministers and their friends to undervalue the importance of a temptation which so long solicited them in vain, and to which they only preferred the sincerity of our public faith, and the integrity of our national honor. They cannot see with indifference an acquisition to general commerce at once so vast in expanse, so various in climate, so fertile in all the materials of industry and manufacture; and in that stage, moreover, of social progress, which, above all others, qualifies it to become the largest customer of a manufacturing nation. They cannot be indifferent under the well-grounded conviction, that this new field will be peculiarly open to British trade and industry, and will at once add to the supply of our stock of raw materials, and to the abundant consumption of our manufactures. They cannot be insensible to the value of a dealer, whose exports to the mother-country, under all the disadvantages of a civil warfare amongst themselves, exceeded fifteen millions; and whose imports were only of less extent under the system of an injudicious monopoly. But in the proportion in which they must feel this satisfaction under the present state of things, do they feel a just pride in the conscious remembrance, that a prize of such splendor, and always lying at their feet, never seduced them from the path of national honor; and that if they have at length attained it, they have attained it with generosity and good faith—*Non cauponantes fidem*, not acting the pedlar and freebooter, but as the representatives of a great state, and of a generous and sincere people, his Majesty's ministers have at once satisfied their own honor, and dignified the character of their country.

Our relations next in order are those with the two governments of France and the Netherlands. It might be sufficient as respects our existing relations with these states, to observe, that they are in perfect concordance with the spirit of the general treaties, and with the maintenance of the best interests of each country respectively. Our intercourse with them, so far as any events since the withdrawing of the armies have led into any, has been that of the most unreserved amity and confidence. It is manifest that in this part of our subject we are treading upon tender ground. Doubtless our advice, under circumstances in which the French government, from their persuasion of our longer experience in the affairs of a mixed constitution, have solicited it, has been given with equal sincerity and good-will. Doubtless, our authority itself has not been refused, where the fermenting ill-spirit during the first years of the peace required the indirect control of the expression of our continuing amity in this tone. But, on the other hand, we have cautiously abstained from any language or conduct, by which we might seem to arrogate the right of interference in the internal affairs of France. With still more delicacy have we abstained from assuming any tone of national superiority, and from employing our actual influence in procuring, or even in soliciting any commercial regulations, which, in the existing spirit of the French people, might increase the difficulties of the king's government. We have never forgotten, that, under some circumstances, and in dealing with natures as generous as truly royal, to ask, is to have, however the concession might embarrass the princely giver, and whatever might be the true character of the gift. But considering that the best interest of England is in the maintenance of tranquillity, and in the permanent return of religion, morals, and good government, to a kingdom so situated as France, we have passed by all single and more peculiar objects, in pursuit of the secure attainment and confirmation of the general end. The language of our foreign relations to France has been and is—Let us see you settled and happy; let us see you occupy your due state in the system of Europe; and we will then, on equal terms, renew with you the race of glory and national wealth.

One of the measures arising from this spirit was the Alien Act, by which we at once performed a duty towards the French government, and exercised an act of immediate prudence towards our public peace at home. His Majesty's ministers retained in their minds, that the former leaders of the Whigs themselves, Lord Fitzwilliam, Mr. Windham, and other names of equal repute, had always entertained a strong apprehension of too free a communication with France; and, during the revolutionary war, had always anticipated, as one of the most dreaded effects of peace, an unrestrained intercourse between the bad men of France and the comparative innocence of the English and Irish Reformers. His Majesty's ministers coincided with his Lordship and other Whigs, still living, in this apprehension. They could not reconcile it to themselves to superadd the lectures of M. Constant to the orations of Mr. Hunt; nor to surrender the innocence of Mr. Cobbett, the moral and religious purity of Mr. Hobhouse, and the truth, the fixed principles, and generous warmth of Sir Robert Wilson, to any possible association with men like Fouché. Though they knew the distinction between laws and manners, between crimes and vices, between acts and opinions, and were aware that it did not belong to governments to make laws against errors and false teachers, they still felt it a duty to guard against the corruption of youth. As regarded France, these considerations were further strengthened by the relative state of the two countries. They could not reconcile it with their sense of duty towards a friendly power to permit a depôt of plots and plotters to be established at Dover. Under all these circumstances, his Majesty's ministers conceded to the best precedents and to the best times, and recommended the Alien Act. The parliament coincided in feeling and opinion with the ministers, and the act was passed with a large majority in both Houses.

As regards our relations with the Netherlands, they are too obvious to require remark. It is sufficient to say, that the amity and confidence of the two governments continue to gather strength with their progress. The completion of the fortresses is, in fact, the completion of the due securities for the permanence of the new general system. It cannot have escaped public observation, that in Holland, as in France, there is not that warm popular feeling towards the government and people of Great Britain, to which we are assuredly most justly entitled by our long constancy in the common cause of Europe. In Holland, as in France, there exists a vulgar opinion, that the true motive of our persevering courage and conduct is to be sought in our commercial spirit; and that our government is still seeking to advance our commerce and manufactures at the expense of all other nations. However false and ungenerous may be such an opinion, it is to be lamented that it still exists. Under these circumstances, his Majesty's ministers have considered it to be a first object of policy, to avoid every kind of conduct which might cherish and increase these unfriendly suspicions. Under the same circumstances, they have declined to solicit for any commercial treaty, or to negociate for any of those facilities (for they can amount to nothing more) which would cost more to the Dutch government than they would be worth to the trade and commerce of the English. But when this observation is made, it is necessary to qualify it by the assertion, that it is very difficult to conceive the possibility of any commercial treaty between England and the Netherlands: there wants indeed all subject-matter for such a treaty. The people of the two states are in direct rivalry with each other. The Dutch and Netherlanders manufacture almost every thing for their own consumption: they have no raw material with which to supply us, nor can we, on the other hand, supply them. They receive their colonial produce from their own planters; they grow their own wool; they import their own cotton; in a word, they exist so nearly in the same stage of commerce and manufactures with ourselves, and grow, work up, and deal so exactly in the same articles, that there is a total want of all subject-matter of exchange between us. The large extent and various climate of France affords her some staples of her own produce, her wines and brandies, for example, upon which to found a commercial exchange; and it is certainly not impossible, but that at some more convenient period the wines of France might be admitted into England, upon the condition of the equivalent admission into France of British cutlery and hardware. But, as regards Holland and the Netherlands, it is almost impossible to discover the materials for any commercial treaty. One article alone with which we supply them, cotton-yarn, was so little satisfactory to our manufacturers of piece-goods, that, in the year 1817, a strong petition was presented to parliament against its exportation; and it required the utmost efforts of his Majesty's ministers to convince the petitioners of the folly of their demand. One observation, indeed, encounters us universally with regard to these commercial treaties. When we look collectively to the petitions of our several manufacturers, and the arguments of their advocates for new commercial treaties, and for opening a more enlarged sphere of foreign trade, they amount to nothing more than to the expression of their wishes, that all foreign markets should be opened to British commodities, whilst the British market should most religiously continue its exclusion against all foreign manufactures. Whilst all demand a free trade and open market, not one of them is willing to surrender to foreigners any restriction in favor of their own commodities. But is it to be expected for a moment, that foreign nations will accede to a treaty under unequal circumstances? Will Portugal, or what is of more importance, will the Brazils, continue a favored consumption of British cotton and woollen manufactures when we shall exclude her wines, or at least withdraw our preference of Portugal in favor of France? Will the landed interest consent to a more free admission of foreign spirits in competition with our own distilleries? Can we in fact lay our hand upon any existing restriction, in favor of British trade, which the manufacturers concerned in that trade would voluntarily concede, or which could be taken from them without such a violence to the actual employment of capital, and without so much suffering to large bodies employed in the manufacture, as to render it very doubtful whether the ultimate good would be worth the present cost? As regards our present subject, Holland, it is impossible not to acknowledge, that our foreign relations can exist in no other form than at present. All closer commercial connection is impossible. The people of Holland and the Netherlands are as jealous of our manufactures as we can possibly be of theirs. The agriculturists and manufacturers of those countries are making the same demands of their government for the exclusive support of their own growth and manufacture. The crown of Holland and the Netherlands is a new institution; it is necessary for the Dutch government to concede even to the popular prejudices. Our increased tax upon the Dutch provision trade, has removed still further any possibility of negociation for commercial advantages. In a word, under our foreign relations with Holland, we possess all that we can possess: the friendship and confidence of the government, and the same degree of trade to which we admit the Dutch and Netherlanders.

As regards Sardinia, Naples, and Italy in general, the spirit of our foreign relations has been directed towards the maintenance of general tranquillity. It was no part of our duty to interfere with the internal concerns of those governments, nor to take any part in such dissensions between them and their neighbours, as did not affect the due distribution of power in the system of Europe. We have no where contracted the obligation to defend these states in all their conflicts with their subjects, or each other. We have no where excluded ourselves from the question of prudence. Accordingly, when the late invasion of these states occurred, the first consideration of our own government was—is there any thing in the circumstances of these dissensions, which either affects the permanence of the general settlement of Europe, or menaces any interest peculiarly British. The answer to these questions was in the negative. No interest was concerned but the internal state of the countries themselves. As respected England, our interference could be accompanied with no possible good, equivalent to its necessary cost. The cause itself afforded no appeal to our generosity. The Carbonari were but French reformers under another name. Under all these circumstances, and this character of the cause, our ministers had the forbearance to adhere to strict neutrality between the contending parties. But as the mere appearance of a good cause could not appeal in vain to British feelings, the English government, following the character and public opinion of the country, did not hesitate to express their own adherence to the principles of general freedom, and to guard their neutrality from any construction unfavorable to the cause of national independence. Whilst, in the exercise of a sound discretion, they adhered to a strict neutrality in fact, they fully asserted the law of nations in their diplomatic correspondence, and effectually published a declaration in recognition of the general principle. In this note, having to address themselves to friendly governments, and to states of dignity and power, they spoke with temper and moderation, but certainly not without dignity and firmness. They have yet to learn, that petulance is the due tone of official intercourse, and that other nations are not entitled to the same courtesy from us, which we are in the habit of exacting from them. They have yet to learn, that the personal indisposition of foreign sovereigns and states, not to say their actual hostility, is a matter of such utter indifference to the government and people of England, as to be needlessly incurred by the application of intemperate language and indecorous terms to kings and emperors. They have yet to learn, that the rules of prudence and decorum in common life are not to be carried into political intercourse; and that in discussing the ordinary differences of states and governments, the tone of mediation is not more effectual, as well as more courteous, than that of arrogance and menace.

Our relations next in order, are those with Austria and Russia. As regards Austria, it is unnecessary to go into any detail; the principal point of incidental contact between Austria and ourselves having been touched upon above—some points, however, may appear to deserve observation. One of these is, the erroneous estimate amongst our popular speakers and writers, of the character and alleged views of this government. No sovereign is perhaps more injuriously treated than the Emperor of Austria. He is not the despotic prince which our libellous writers represent. Considering the extent of his dominions, and their exposed condition, the defensive power of the Emperor of Austria is not equal to the dignity and station of his empire in the European commonwealth. His kingdom is composed of members too distinct, having little more union than in the circumstance of their being governed by a common sovereign: whilst each member is alike suspicious, lest the force of one part should be directed towards the subversion of the privileges of the other. The power of the sovereign, under the Hungarian constitution, amounts to little more than the feudal superiority of the supreme chief over his barons. In his German states, the power of the emperor is rather patrimonial than political. In Italy, he has to contend with an adverse public opinion, and with the natural hostility of a people subjected to a foreign ruler. The local character of his dominions, and their relative situation towards each other, are equally ill adapted to compose a compact power, or to constitute a force of ready application. The greater portion of his kingdom consists of a plain level country, intersected, indeed, by large rivers, but almost totally without any defensive strength upon its frontier. The political character of Austria is necessarily governed by these circumstances of its imperfect means of protection. If the re-construction of the Dutch barrier, by means of the kingdom of the Netherlands, have given additional security to Austria on the part of France, the growth of the Prussian monarchy, and the extension of that of Russia, have introduced other and larger objects, which, in the vicissitudes of time, and in the varying policy of cabinets, may more seriously affect the safety of the House of Austria. It is far, very far from the purpose of the present observations *spargere voces ambiguas*, or to give countenance to reports which, under present circumstances, have no shadow of foundation in truth. But the prudence of states, which we call policy, has necessarily a longer reach than the precautionary wisdom of private life. It is the duty of Austria to consider the future as well as the present. The generosity and moderation of her present neighbours are their personal virtues; their successors may be more open to temptation. Under such circumstances, the situation of Austria is one of much delicacy and difficulty, and her policy necessarily partakes of this character. She must vigilantly attend to the maintenance of her actual power; she must jealously guard that system of Europe, the continuance of which is her best security, and most effectual strength. In a word, it peculiarly belongs to her relations to encounter, in their first re-appearance, the return of those principles, to the progress of which she would necessarily become the first sacrifice.

The tone and conduct of the British government towards Austria, have been regulated by a knowledge of these circumstances, in her situation. Doubtless his Majesty's ministers well knew her difficulties, with regard to her Italian states, and as the due power of Austria is necessary for the system of Europe, they must at once have known and lamented the reluctant obedience of her Italian subjects. They could not but be informed by their resident ministers in Italy, that a very dangerous faction was gaining a most alarming strength, and that it particularly menaced the Austrian dominions. Considering the local contact of the Alpine states with France, and with that part of France which, within a very short period, had been the chief scene upon which the troubles of Europe were renewed, the British cabinet could not but entertain some apprehension for the safety of the general system. The next house had caught fire, before the flames were well extinguished in its adjoining neighbourhood. It was under these circumstances, that his Majesty's ministers deemed that the situation of Austria justified some latitude in her defensive measures. If the Austrian government appeared to some persons, to assert too broadly the principle of this invasion, the British cabinet deemed it sufficient upon their part, to declare their own construction of the public law of Europe; at the same time rendering justice to the peculiar situation of Austria.

This danger, and assuredly not an inconsiderable danger, has now happily passed away. We are now instructed by events. But will it be denied in the face of these events, that experience has well justified the wisdom of the policy pursued by the British government? What might not have been the situation of Europe, if the King's ministers, following the rash but perhaps generous impulse of public opinion, and adopting the injudicious vehemence of the Opposition, had immediately involved the nation in this contest? Naples would still have been over-run, Sardinia would still have submitted; her revolutionary army would still have been dispersed. We could have intermeddled with no other effect than to excite an unfriendly feeling in our former allies, and to cherish the designs of the ill-disposed throughout Europe. We must have interposed, if at all, either by the exercise of our influence, or, more authoritatively, by a direct declaration that the rights of nations were invaded. If by our influence, the peril of Austria was possibly too immediate to induce her to surrender the interests of her own safety to our remonstrance and advice. If we had assumed a more authoritative tone, our naval armament, in support of our declaration, would scarcely have reached the Neapolitan sea before the submission of Naples and Piedmont would have rendered it nugatory. What must then have been the course suitable to the honor and dignity of England? Either we must have renewed the general war for such objects, or have withdrawn with a barren exertion of our authority; to say nothing of our internal situation at this period, and of the importance of not suffering any remote and incidental object to impede us in the great work of national retrenchment.

The interests of the several European states are so involved with each other, that it is perhaps an imperfect method to enumerate, thus distinctly, our foreign relation with the several states individually. Our relations with Russia are but little different from the same relations with Asutria. Our leading object with both has been to confirm the full confidence established at the period of the treaties. His Majesty's ministers have felt none of that jealousy towards the Emperor of Russia, to which they have been strongly urged by the gentlemen of the Opposition. They have seen nothing in the conduct of Russia to justify such a jealousy. All the public measures of Russia since the peace, have been characterised with the sincerity and moderation of her emperor. The powers of Europe, whose dominions are in immediate contact with those of Russia, have expressed no jealousy of this kind; and his Majesty's ministers have deemed it absurd to admit apprehensions for Austria, Prussia, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, which none of those states feel for themselves. It is impossible but that much variety of opinion and feelings must exist in a court and cabinet composed like that of Russia; but it is equally notorious, that the personal moderation of the sovereign is seconded in its effect by his uncontrolled power under the Russian constitution. Ministers cannot forget, that when the vast spoil of the French conquest was *in medio* at the period of the general peace, the Emperor Alexander contended with England in a high-minded and generous abstinence from all claims for himself. They cannot forget, that having then the power to retain, and certainly not without the strongest claims to indemnity for his sufferings during the invasion of his empire, he concurred as fully as themselves in the restoration of kingdoms, provinces, cities, and towns, to their former possessors. Remembering this, they possibly think they do him only justice in inferring his moderation under less temptation, by his experienced magnanimity under greater.

One event indeed has arisen which has placed the Emperor Alexander in a situation of much difficulty, and which, in some of its circumstances, has apparently given countenance to the assertions of popular writers. The insurrection of the Greeks against Turkey has necessarily involved a prince and people of the same religion with themselves. There is a strange injustice amongst our party-writers in considering the situation of the Emperor Alexander, as regards this unforeseen event. They entirely overlook circumstances obvious to all but themselves, and which stand forth upon the very face of his situation. They impute to his own seeking, and to his seeking for a selfish purpose, an extreme state of difficulties, manifestly thrown upon him by fortune. The Russian people, and of course the Russian army, are not only of the same religion, but exercise it precisely in the same form with the Greeks. The great body of the Russian population has not yet reached the high degree of civilisation of some parts of Europe. It is more simple in its habits, and at the same time less corrupted. Their hearts are most warmly attached to the religion of their country:—their religious faith is more singly the object of their affection. We may all remember what a degree of popular clamor was excited amongst ourselves, about three years since, by some false and absurd reports of a persecution against the Protestants in a remote part of France. But if such a feeling, and upon such an occasion, was raised among our own people, whose character at the present day is assuredly not an excess of religious enthusiasm, and whose affections are subdivided amongst the hundred other objects of attachment in a rich and luxurious community; is it difficult to conceive what must be the general sensation throughout the Russian empire, where such acts, exercised against the most sacred persons of the same religious faith, were passing in adjoining provinces; and where these acts were brought home with so much increased force to their feelings and passions, by the daily reception and personal supplication of the persecuted fugitives? Is it any reasonable subject of astonishment, that under the presence of such images, and under the daily exhortation of priests of the same religion, a kind of epidemic indignation should run through the body of the Russian people, and that the contagion in some degree should reach the army? Far be it from the writer of these remarks to insinuate any imputation against the officers and men of an army, who in the common contest for the deliverance of Europe sustained at least their equal part. The truth is, that they could not have been men, and assuredly not the brave and generous people which they are, if they had beheld without sympathy the scenes and acts which were passing before their eyes. Under such circumstances, it is necessary to insist further upon the extreme difficulty of the situation of the Emperor Alexander in the dissensions between Greece and Turkey? Supposing for a moment, but which must not be supposed, that he did not himself partake of this feeling of his people and army; it is manifestly contrary to every rule of prudence that he should oppose himself singly and directly to this national enthusiasm. It was totally impossible to stem such a torrent by moving in a direct line across it. There are some circumstances in the general condition of a foreign state, which should be touched with the same delicacy as if belonging more immediately to the privacy of common life. It is presumed that enough has already been said to enable the candid reader to enter into the situation of the Emperor Alexander, and to deduce the inference, that this sovereign has not failed in his obligations to the general system of Europe.

Nor in forming an estimate of the conduct of this sovereign should it be omitted, that he most readily assented to the British protection of the Ionian Islands, and this at a period when all Europe was ringing with a clamor against his alleged designs in the Mediterranean. This act of magnanimity is, indeed, in itself an answer to all illiberal suspicions; for if the object of Russia had been the conquest of Turkey, and the ultimate appropriation of its provinces, her cabinet could never have consented to this anticipated cession of a part of her spoil, and still less could have augmented, if not established, a power in the Mediterranean that must always be opposed to the accomplishment of such an object.

At the time these observations are writing, the question of Greece and Turkey is still undetermined. In such a state of things it must be sufficient to observe that there exists a sincere effort amongst all the powers of Europe, and with the English government in particular, to procure a settlement of these differences upon views of general policy and a due consideration of the whole case. Their mediation between Turkey, Russia, and the Greeks, is regulated upon two main principles—the first, the termination of a state of things, which in its ultimate consequence, may effect the general peace of Europe; the second, a security on the part of Turkey against any fanatical revenge or future excesses by her misguided populace. If the Greek insurrection, and the pending discussions between Russia and Turkey can be finally settled upon this basis, all parties may have just cause for satisfaction. The Greeks will obtain a security against future oppression; the Emperor Alexander will have satisfied his people and himself; and Europe will have extinguished a fire which, though beginning only on its remote circumference, but finding fuel as it moved along, might have burned to the centre.

It is doubtless a natural wish amongst all Christian nations, that a people so connected with the fondest images of our imagination, and carrying us by associations not only to our own early lives, but to scenes and characters immortalised by poets and orators, should obtain a better return for its sufferings, and should more nearly accomplish its independence. But in this case, as in others, where the subject is the member of a system, the question has two bearings—there is a particular interest, and there is a general interest. As regards the particular interest of Greece only, there can exist no doubt what ought to be the wish and object of herself and friends. But as regards the general interest of Europe, and as respects the maintenance of principles, upon which the safety of all empires must stand, it is impossible that the great powers can actively co-operate in the pending contest. The very progress of this conflict, without their co-operation, holds forth such a possible state of things—so many disjointed members, and such a difficulty to effect a due disposition of them—such a disturbance in the actual state of possession, and such an uncertainty of retaining the relative équality of states by a new proportionate distribution, as to render even neutrality a very questionable prudence. *Sed incedimus per ignes.* It is one of the hard conditions of fortune that our duties are sometimes in direct opposition with our feelings. But let it not be said or thought, that Englishmen cannot feel for Greece. The wheel of human affairs, running through every possible evolution, may ultimately cast up a condition of things in which our wishes and duties may be in union; and Greece in her freedom may delight us with a more lively resemblance of the mother from which she springs—*Turne, quod optanti, &c.*

Our relations with Turkey are necessarily comprehended in those with Greece and Russia. A word only may conclude this part of the subject:—Whatever may be the character of Turkey and her government, Turkey is *de facto* an independent power in Europe, and has a certain place and station to fill. Having such a character, it is to the interest of Europe that Turkey should possess the means of maintaining it. She cannot fail in her part without proportionately disturbing the general order. It is peculiarly the interest of England that Turkey should possess this relative sufficiency; and it is our best preventive policy to maintain her in this degree of strength. Our diplomatic intercourse with her government has always been directed towards this end. But, under present circumstances, in order to accomplish this object, it has perhaps become necessary rather to increase, than to reduce, her power. The efficiency of Turkey is counteracted by two main circumstances—her internal dissensions, and the peculiar character of her military force. But if it be our manifest policy to uphold Turkey in a certain degree of strength, it is assuredly a violation of all principle to encourage these sources of her weakness. His Majesty's ministers are doubtless acting upon an inference so manifestly just. They can see no certain advantage in further reducing the power of Turkey, nor in concurring in any line of policy which would effectually lead to such a reduction. They see that Turkey in her actual state gives no disturbance to the general system; but they are not equally certain that a new state of things may not lead to very unforeseen consequences. They can see no prudence in foregoing a safe actual condition for an uncertain futurity. It is under these considerations that the British minister at Constantinople is probably instructed to regulate his intercourse with the Turks. He is probably authorised to second the representations of the Sublime Porte to Russia, that the militia of the provinces is retained, encamped, and in winter quarters, less under any desire or apprehension of war, than with the purpose of using the occasion to reduce and extinguish the Janizaries. He is probably instructed to confirm the assurances of the Porte, that the abolition of this barbarous and fanatic force would be the best guarantee against future excesses. Under the constitution of Turkey the Janizaries are a standing army almost independent of the government, and therefore its absolute master. They are a feudal army, a deliberating army, a military corporation; having privileges of their own, and all, officers and men, uniting in maintaining and advancing them against their sovereign and fellow subjects. It is scarcely possible not to feel for a sovereign in such circumstances, and possibly this representation has not been made in vain to the Emperor Alexander.

Our foreign relations next in order, and our last in the long list, for we pass over those with the minor states as necessarily involved in our policy towards the greater, are those with the United States of America.

It is a just observation of moral writers, that the happiest condition of human fortune is in the uniform and uninterrupted current of ordinary life, affording, from day to day, only the same unvaried aspect. The same observation may be extended generally to the relations of kingdoms, and to those between England and America in particular, which are perhaps never more satisfactory than when they least afford matter of remark. Our relations with America are those of two governments respecting the character of each other, and remembering their common origin whilst they look around upon their different institutions.

The situation of America, and her manifest policy under it, is marked by one strong circumstance:—Of all the nations in the world, America has suffered most by the return of peace. Her commerce, her customs, and her total revenue, have been diminished, at certain periods since the peace, by more than one half. In the year 1815 the net produce of her customs exceeded thirty-six millions of dollars. In the year 1819 the produce of the same duties was only seventeen millions, being a diminution of nineteen million dollars out of thirty-six. Her total revenue, in 1815, was in round figures forty-nine and a half millions of dollars. In 1819 her total revenue was not twenty one millions and a half. This diminution was chiefly in her customs, which declined from the cessation of her carrying trade, and the resumption by foreign nations of their own commerce.

These circumstances in her situation are of so much more importance to us, as they at once explain the causes which, in a less degree, affected ourselves, and as their operation in both countries has been in kind the same. As England, during the war, manufactured for the world, America, in a very great degree was the carrier of the world. Even her raw produce was raised to an immense price by the demand for it on the continent of Europe. There was a constant exportation of her flour to England, on an average exceeding half a million of barrels, and, in the years 1801, 1802, and 1811, exceeding a million. Her flour, cotton, tobacco, and whatever else she exported of raw produce, thus attained a price exceeding in all articles one third, and, in many, double its present amount. Her freights, her shipping, her navy—her price of land, her amount of circulating currency, her wages of labor, and her returns of capital; in a word, her agriculture, her commerce, her navigation, her internal industry and improvement, and whatever she possessed of rough domestic manufactures, increased in the same general rate as amongst ourselves. Under the general competition of one branch of employment with another, added to the universal demand for labor, and to the abundance of money in paper and cash, prices rose throughout all commodities, and in every division of industry. The general peace overtook America in this state of things. Her commerce immediately fell, and fell by nearly one half. Her circulating capital, her paper-currency, was necessarily called in, or forced back in the same proportion. Most of her banks, trading only on accommodation, broke up, and by their bankruptcy, and the general alarm excited by it, still farther reduced or rather almost extinguished, their paper medium. Under this general state of things, prices now fell as abruptly in peace, as they had risen during the war. The cessation of a great portion of foreign demand, necessarily caused a glut of all raw produce in her markets. Prices thus fell from abundance. The withdrawing of the foreign carrying trade, and of foreign commerce in general, reduced the general income of the nation; and as this trade had been carried on in a great degree by new men, and as profits, however large, had either been expended by a more profuse mode of living, or had been embarked in augmenting stocks, (now violently rendered of less than half their recent value), income was destroyed before capitals were accumulated. Prices thus fell from the second cause of the reduced general means. The diminution of the quantum of the currency of cash and paper necessarily followed, as above said, the diminution of trade. There were fewer dealings, and of course less occasion for the medium by which they were computed. There was no security in future profits, and of course no loans nor accommodation. There was no employment for capital, and of course neither the means nor the inducement to create or to continue it artificially. Prices thus fell from the third cause of the reduced quantity of money. Under this concurrence of circumstances, America has been suffering in a greater degree than ourselves, and affords a strong illustration of the actual causes of what we have seen amongst our own merchants, manufacturers, and farmers. If we have suffered, indeed, in a less degree from some of these causes, it is only because our state of society is more advanced, and that our capitalists are less dependent upon their income from year to year. The national wealth of England is composed of two descriptions, accumulated capital, and current income. The one may suffer in the vicissitudes of commerce, trade, and in the pecuniary value of produce in the markets; but the other fund is necessarily more permanent, and in a rich society will maintain a large consumption for many successive years. But in all new countries, like America, the national wealth consists in little more than in the annual income. For the time, the withdrawing of income is with them reduction to poverty.

This condition of America leads to another important conclusion, and to one more immediately bearing upon our foreign relations with her government. Of the whole actual revenue of the United States, about twenty-five million dollars, eighteen millions are raised by her customs. Of so much importance to that government is the collection of her customs, or in other words, the continuance of her commerce. But it is unnecessary to observe, that an interest of this kind must bind her strongly to the maintenance of her pacific and friendly relations with England. It is impossible to imagine any event more injurious to the commerce of America and England than an interruption of these relations. It must be a war directly against the commerce of each other. America must at once lose three out of five parts of her national revenue, and whatever she retains of trade must disappear from the face of the ocean. England, on the other hand, would undoubtedly lose the supply of her best customer, and it is difficult to imagine any thing that she could gain.

The foreign relations of the two states have necessarily some respect towards these circumstances of their relative situation, as great commercial dealers. It would assuredly be as unjust, as it is mean, to impute the existing amity to these causes only. The governors of both proceed from a stock, with whom justice and generosity are always more than mere names, and who require no proof of interest to retain them within the obligations of moral duty. But it is the nature of man, and indeed it is his duty, to give due weight to considerations of personal prudence. With every allowance for national generosity, the practical statesman will always see with pleasure this concurrence of interest and duty in neighbouring states. He has a good reliance, who has to deal with good faith and honor. But he has a better, who has to deal with good faith and common interest.

As to any practical subjects which have recently arisen under the head of our foreign relations with America, three circumstances of principal importance have occurred since the war, in all of which has been manifested the amicable disposition of the two states towards each other. The convention of commerce, which was to expire in 1819, has been renewed for ten years, until the year 1828. The British government has opposed no obstacle to the cession of the Floridas: but, on the contrary, has co-operated with the American minister in removing difficulties, and in influencing the Spanish government to execute the articles of their treaty with the United States. The third circumstance regards the navigation acts of the two countries. It was not consistent with British policy to extend the admission of foreigners into our colonial trade. It would have interfered too much with the interests of our own merchants and shipping. But we did not wholly repel the solicitations of a friendly government on this head. By instituting, or at least continuing in peace, the special free port of the Bermudas, we enabled America to supply herself directly with British colonial produce, and thus saved her the expense of longer voyages, and larger freights. The American government was still dissatisfied, and in 1817, and 1818, passed her own navigation laws. We admitted her right to do so, and the friendly relations of the two governments remain uninterrupted. It may be allowed us to express a sincere hope, that the confidence and amicable intercourse of the two governments may long continue, and that the United States may rapidly recover that condition of foreign commerce, and internal trade and industry, which so long rendered them the large and liberal customers of the merchants and manufacturers of Great Britain. It will be time enough, a century hence, to think of contending interests. It is the absence of a friendly spirit to anticipate, amidst peace and good-will, the possible condition of rivalry and hostility. The sea is open to both nations, and assuredly there is no disposition in England to appropriate this highway of the world. America has a territory, and a new and virgin territory, almost as spacious as the face of the seas themselves. She is of the same stock, and has the same materials of greatness and future glory with Great Britain. Let her use the example we have set her, and run the same race.

Such is the question as regards the integrity of our foreign relations.

HOME DEPARTMENT.

The province of the minister in this department is to maintain the general order and tranquillity of the kingdom, and to secure and superintend the due administration of the laws. In accomplishing this object, his Majesty's Secretary of State for the Home Department has to direct his most vigilant attention to whatever may menace the internal order of the country. It is his duty to foresee and to prevent, as well as to encounter and suppress, all acts of turbulence and disorder. It is his further duty, in execution of the same object, to assist and uphold the local magistracy of the kingdom. He must employ the means of government, and apply the wisdom and learning of the law-officers attached to its public service, to explain difficult points of duty. He must call into action the power of government to maintain the administration of the law against a populace inflamed into seditious proceedings. In preserving the peace of the metropolis, as well as of other districts, he must superintend and regulate the police. Remembering always that he is the minister of a free government, and that every department of administration should have reference to the general character of the constitution, he should execute his duties with as little cost as possible to personal liberty. He should deserve the praise that the first of all historians gave to one of the first of all ministers.—*In rebus arduis severitate, sed non asperitate utens, rempublicam composuit; unde restituta reverentia legibus, judiciis auctoritas; et sacris, et moribus, et unocuique jus et honos.* He should not apply the extraordinary means of the constitution to its ordinary perils. His weapons, and the use of them, should not exceed the call of the occasion. His first duty is to suppress the peril; his second, is to effect this purpose with as little cost as possible. In his apprehension of an extraordinary danger, he should not lose all apprehension of the certain violence to general principles by extraordinary means. He should remember the future in the present, and that the acts of ministers of good repute, and in times above all suspicion of sinister purposes, may become precedents for their successors, who, under a general resemblance of the occasion, may most perniciously extend the example.

It is a subject of much satisfaction, that the present state of the country renders it rather ungracious to revive the memory of its condition during the first years of the peace. Except for the purpose of rendering justice to his Majesty's ministers, more especially to the noble lord who has presided over this department for the last nine years; and but for the purpose of recalling to general attention what difficulties they have encountered, and from what perils they have delivered the public peace, it would be more satisfactory to every lover of his country to pass over that period, and, under the present state of public tranquillity, to forget that the condition of the kingdom was not always so secure. It is a trite observation of moralists, that nothing is so soon forgotten as danger wholly surmounted. But it should not be entirely dismissed from the public mind, that in 1817, and the next following years, the state of public affairs required two or more Secret Committees of both Houses of Parliament, and that these Committees, composed of gentlemen of all parties, concurred in a Report, that a most alarming degree of seditious practice existed throughout the kingdom. It should not be wholly forgotten, that this Report was verified in practice by two or more audacious conspiracies, and, after some interval, by the discovery of a most murderous plot for assassinating all his Majesty's ministers. The atrocity of this plot was assuredly not extenuated by its folly. Nearly at the same point of time large assemblies of the misguided populace were convoked from week to week in the vicinity of our manufacturing towns, and were instructed, exhorted, and inflamed, by travelling incendiaries. It is as unnecessary, as it is unpleasing, to repeat circumstances now remembered as only having been escaped. But it is surely a want of feeling towards the difficulties of his Majesty's ministers, at that period, to forget their merits in their success. If the vessel of the state be now in port, surely some credit is due to those by whose labor she was worked through such a tempest. The danger was not under-rated at the time by a very large majority in parliament. We see what is the actual state of things under the operation of the ministerial measures then adopted. We see a condition of present safety, and of actual deliverance. It is against all fairness to refuse imputing the effects to a cause so directly bearing upon them. What might have been the effect of other measures is at least uncertain. What has been the effect of the actual conduct of administration, is before the eyes of all of us. It is not our purpose to occupy the reader with subjects repeatedly discussed in both houses of parliament. Suffice it to say, generally, under this head of maintaining the public tranquillity and peace of the kingdom, that the attention of his Majesty's Home Secretary was invariably directed to the three main points—of encountering seditious principles at their origin, of upholding the local magistracy of the kingdom, and of not putting to risk the authority of the laws by a too frequent resort to prosecutions.

Upon some points, forbearance is self-abandonment. It cannot be concealed, that in parts of the kingdom, and in some periods of this crisis, loose principles, to say nothing more, were spreading very far; and that the contagion was reaching that part of our judiciary system, which, in all countries where the noble institution of juries exists, can alone give effect to the laws. Some acquittals were at least extraordinary. Under such circumstances, it was a manifest line of prudence, to rely more upon the menace of law, than upon the execution of law. Restraint and prevention had not only more of lenity, but more of policy, than direct prosecution. This was the principle of the measures of that period. The most immediate object was to restrain those libellers, and to check that general circulation of their cheap seditious tracts, which were the first movers of the popular turbulence. It was a point of first importance to restrain them at once; to arrest the mischief in its origin; and the law officers of the crown entertained no doubt of the legality of putting them at once under bail. The question has since been set at rest. There is no longer any doubt, that the law contains in itself this efficient control against the continuance of a crime decidedly assailing the public peace. The subject of astonishment is that there could exist any doubt upon such a proposition. Is the discretion of a magistrate to be trusted to require bail for the peace, under the apprehension of the personal security of individuals; and is the same protection to be withholden from the greater interests of the public safety? But in the one instance you have an offence committed, and a demand of sureties made. And have you not the same in the other? In the latter, only, the magistrate represents the law, and takes the due security for the public. In both, the law trusts alike to his judgment and discretion. The oath of the party applying for bail, in private menaces or assaults, is only one of the circumstances for informing the discretion of the judge. In libel, he sees the alleged offence before him, and may reasonably infer the further peril against which he requires the security.

In conclusion of these precautions for maintaining the public peace, and for assisting, countenancing, and upholding the local magistracy of the disturbed districts, it may generally be observed, that the measures of Lord Sidmouth had all the same character and object. *Quod metus ad omnes, &c.* Their execution in practice corresponded with this moderation in purpose. They have all effected their object by prevention only. The business has been done by exciting the salutary apprehension of the seditious and turbulent. Assuredly, measures of such firmness were never executed with such moderation. The six acts, as they have been termed from their number, exist only as so many wholesome rods, suspended over the heads of the seditious leaders. The sword, indeed, hangs by a thread; but it falls not; whilst the terror of its fall restrains the audacious. The greater portion of the blasphemous and seditious publications has nearly disappeared. If some still continue to insult the morals and good sense of the people, the resort to juries is become safe and certain. The most perilous and malignant of these libellers has become a commentator on Swedish turnips and Leghorn bonnets. In a word, at no period, perhaps, is the public tranquillity throughout England and Scotland more firmly settled than at the present. Others are suffering, and it may be added, without compassion from any quarter, the just retribution for their audacious wickedness, under the verdicts of their countrymen. In no single instance whatever, within the last four years, has government failed in its resort to juries, whether in prosecutions for treason, libel, or seditious misdemeanor; whether for the consummation of the crime in its first form, or for its origination in the latter.

It is impossible, indeed, not to congratulate the country upon the restoration of internal order. If one branch of our industry is necessarily suffering under national and accidental causes; if the surplus produce of two or three years of agriculture be still acting in England as in France, and depressing the price of corn in the market; all the parties concerned in its sale or growth still do justice to the laws and government of the country, and impute not the necessities of nature to the negligence of ministers. They all recognise with the report of the Agricultural Committee, that protection cannot be carried further than prohibition. It cannot enter into the mind of any of them, that government can force the consumption of the country. Every reasonable expectation will be satisfied by the economy and retrenchments now in progress. It can never become the wish of an honest and intelligent people to put into peril the immediate safety of the nation; and, assuredly, the integrity of its future means of defence, by the momentary admission of any proposition affecting the public faith. What interest could promise itself a moment's safety, under the general convulsion which would follow the disturbance of property, as sacred as the title of the lands? Parliament has a natural power, and parliament has a moral power. Its natural power is to do any thing: its moral power is to act only according to the obligations of justice. Parliament, therefore, has no power to cancel obligations of this kind. But are we not here fighting shadows? Under our most confirmed confidence in the honor of the country, we sincerely believe that we are; and that no proposition of this kind has any chance of finding such support as to render it an object of momentary apprehension. The example of the United States of

America will not here be lost upon us. In the year 1819, when her revenue had fallen from thirty-six million dollars to seventeen millions; a fall equivalent to the reduction of our own total income from fifty-six millions to twenty-five; and when, under these circumstances, there was a faint proposition about reducing the interest of the national debt, the government and congress rejected it with indignation. As respects ourselves indeed, could the proposal only be made; could the mere mention in Parliament only be admitted, without causing such a panic, and thereupon such a violent reduction in the price of stocks, as would at once introduce general disorder and ruin? One act of meditated violence would lead in the instant to the necessity of another, and a law must be passed to prevent the sale of stock in the interval between the discussion and settlement of the question. Whilst France is paying more than six per cent. upon her national stock, and whilst her security is such as it actually is, what could prevent the stockholders, under the starting of such a proposition, from the instant transfer of their funds? But it is unpleasant to any mind of due feeling to dwell upon the bare probability of a measure of this kind. In regular governments, there is no gradation of value in the titles of property. All titles in the eye of political justice are the same; they all rest alike on the faith and integrity of the laws of the country.

But enough upon this point. We rest assured, that they were not mere words of course, which, upon the close of the session of parliament in the year 1819, the speaker of the House of Commons so eloquently addressed to His Majesty—"We feel satisfied, that at this period, and at every other, there is no difficulty which the country will not encounter, and no pressure to which she will not willingly and cheerfully submit, to enable her to maintain, pure and unimpaired, that which has never yet been shaken or sullied—her public credit, and her national good faith."

As regards the particular measures which are connected with the improvement and maintenance of the internal order of the kingdom, and which may, therefore, more properly fall under this part of our subject; the principal are the acts for maintaining the due administration of law in Ireland; the encouragement of fisheries and public works, for the employment of the poor; the revision and consolidation of the laws affecting the clergy; the prison discipline, the gaol consolidation, and police bills. To which may be added, several minor measures, either immediately introduced by government, or most cordially supported by the ministers, in aid of the internal order and economy of every part of the United Kingdom.

Of these objects, the first in importance, is the improvement and restoration of the due administration of law in Ireland. As the magistracy of Ireland have an immediate official correspondence with the Irish secretary, and, through him, with his Majesty's Secretary for the Home Department, the fullest memorials of its actual condition were, of course, transmitted to this latter office. It is only justice to the minister of that department to state, that all these memorials received his most anxious attention. The representations from all quarters were duly weighed and considered; a work of incredible difficulty, as will appear from a very summary abstract of their substantial proposals and complaints.

In proceeding with this brief exposition, it must be again premised, that the object of these observations is a defensive statement, to which a liberal latitude must be necessarily given. Far, very far, is it from our purpose to sow any seeds of distrust and discontent between any classes of men. But it must be allowed to the friends of his Majesty's ministers to repel any unjust imputation upon the government of the country, though with the effect of transferring it in some degree to individuals, who inconsiderately, perhaps, but assuredly, in fact, are the chief causes of their own misfortunes.

The memorials upon the state of Ireland, and upon the actual causes of its internal disorders, comprehend a long list of grievances; the principal of which are, absenteeship, disproportionate rents, the want of all poor laws, the comparatively defective state of industry, illicit distillation, the uneducated state of the poor, superabundance of population, and the want of employment. To which may be added, as two of these heads of complaint in point of fact, (whether just or unjust) the inefficiency of the local magistracy and police, and the want of a permanent Insurrection act.

The first complaint, therefore, according to these channels of representation, is the mischief of absenteeship, as it is termed, by which they mean the non-residence of the landed proprietors, and which non-residence some of the memorialists most absurdly impute to government. In considering this complaint, his Majesty's ministers doubtless saw that the question distributed itself into two points of inquiry; the first, was it a mischief and in what extent; and secondly, did it admit of any remedy on the part of government?

As to the first of these points, they were probably forced to conclude, that, under the peculiar circumstances of Ireland, the question admitted of no doubt. It could not escape their observation, that absenteeship existed to a most enormous extent, and that it was, and is, productive, in a very great degree, of the continuing misery and distress of the people. In a rich, active, and industrious country like England, where agriculture, commerce, and manufactures exist in such an extent, as to afford occupation to the population, in a ratio nearly co-extensive with its amount, the absence of a few hundred landed proprietors is of no national importance. They are not the chief customers of the national agriculture, commerce, and manufactures. England works for the civilised world, and not merely for its own country gentlemen. Accordingly, the casual absenteeship of English gentlemen, in the course of their travelling, or long abode abroad, is totally without effect upon the large subject-matter of English consumption. The withdrawing of their expenditure is like the abstraction of a drop from a running stream, and, in a national consideration, is wholly without any momentary importance. But, in a country like Ireland, where there is so little of commerce and manufactures, and a most imperfect and narrow agriculture, the system of absenteeship, is necessarily productive of extensive mischief. It is the absence of the national protectors, benefactors, and sole employers of the great body of the nation. It is the withdrawing of a large demand for labor, from a country which requires that demand in every possible shape. It reduces, and has reduced, the Irish poor to a similar state with what was the condition of the English poor in the age of Henry the Eighth, and in the early part of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, when the suppression of the monasteries turned them loose upon the nation at large, and rendered necessary the enactment of the poor-laws. It spreads hopeless poverty, irremediable ignorance, and barbarous ferocity, through the population. It substitutes the interested overseer, the avaricious, or at least trading, middle-man, the ignorant, and therefore comparatively unfeeling factor and agent for country gentlemen and landlords, whose interests, education, and habits, would lead them to the improvement and assistance of their tenants, and of the peasantry in their neighbourhood or estates. It nearly eradicates charity, the last refuge of the poor and miserable. As regards this head of complaint, and its effect upon Ireland, it can scarcely therefore be contended, that the complaints of absentee landlords, and of the evils thereby caused, are overcharged.

The next alleged evil in these memorials was in the oppression of the poor tenants, and of the poor in general, by rents enormously disproportionate to the value of the land. This, up to a certain extent, is true, and is likewise a peculiar evil in the condition of the Irish. In England the price of labor, and the wages of all kinds of industry, necessarily keep down the price of land to the level of its actual worth, and accordingly, as we see under present circumstances, any demand of extravagant rents would remedy itself—no one would give it. The answer would be, I make more by my daily labor as a husbandman, a manufacturer, or an artizan. But in Ireland, where there is no such demand for labor in agriculture, manufactures, or internal industry, the poor laborer has no choice—he must procure his quarter of an acre of ground for potatoes, or he must starve. Every poor Irishman is in the same need and in the same condition; they accordingly bid each against the other, and their necessity and their competition have enormously increased the price of land. Again, as population always keeps pace with the quantity of food upon which life can be sustained, and as an acre of potatoes (however miserable such kind of food may be) will feed twice the number of human beings which an acre of wheat will feed, the Irish poor go on daily increasing, and more distressed objects are daily growing up to bid against those already in the market, and to effect still further this ruinous subdivision of the land into small portions and patches. Every patch, in fact, thus produces a new family; every member of a family a new patch and so on. Hence an enormous population, and an enormous rent for these small divisions. Hence a country covered with beggars—a complete pauper-warren. Under this head of grievance it was equally impossible to insist that the statement was much overcharged; but what remedy did this admit on the part of government? If, by the fundamental principles of our constitution, every individual amongst us is the uncontrolled master of his own person, except when the state requires his service under an obligation common to all classes of subjects, still more is he master of his own property. A particular law against personal liberty, or a particular statute against the unqualified dominion of a proprietor over his own property, would be alike an invasion of the first principles of our constitution. Under these principles, the two first heads of complaint—absenteeship and high rents—admitted but the same answer; they belong to manners, and not to laws; to the native local gentry, and not to the United Parliament.

The third alleged cause is the want of employment and of capital; the absence of almost all manufactures but linen; and the comparatively defective state of industry. It was equally impossible to deny the existence of this head of causes; but it is at least equally absurd to impute the existence of this condition to government. In England, the employment of the poor is distributed through agriculture, commerce, manufactures, internal trade, the mechanic arts, and the supply of the large consumption of a highly civilised, rich, and luxurious people. The circulating capital of the country may possibly employ about three-fourths of its laboring population; the income of accumulated capital, expended only in consumption, affords nearly a full employment to the remainder. In Ireland, the amount of capital circulating in trade is assuredly very little; and the amount of income from capital formerly accumulated, or the fruits of savings from large incomes, bears a very small proportion to the same species of income in England. Whilst the population of Ireland is nearly one half of that of England, the consumption of Ireland of all articles of elegance, convenience, and luxury, is less than one-tenth of that of England. The gross actual receipt of the excise for England, in the year ending the 5th of January, 1821, was upwards of twenty-seven millions; whilst the same receipt for Ireland was little more than one million nine hundred thousand pounds. It is true that the excise of the two countries does not comprehend entirely the same articles, nor in many cases the same duties; but there is nearly the same disproportion of one to ten, if the produce of the same commodity in the one country be compared with its produce in the other. It is therefore perfectly true that Ireland contains at once a great redundant population, and a very inadequate employment for its laboring classes. The unfortunate system of subdividing the land, in some of the counties, into an infinite number of small tenements, is the undoubted cause of the redundant population. Every acre is thus made to produce as many mouths as it can miserably feed. In the inconsiderate language of her best poet, every rood of land maintains its man. Hence a defect of agricultural capital, and hence likewise, as unhappily proved by experience, an invincible temptation to idle and vagabond habits in the Irish poor, from the absence of the necessity of the owners of these tenements and their families to procure the food of the day by the labor of the day. May the example become a salutary lesson to England of the effects of the minute subdivision of the soil, and of the absurdity of that loose and idle declamation, which would relieve the current distress of the poor by distributing amongst them the wastes and commons of the country.

It was impossible therefore to deny the justice of this head of complaint; but what remedy does it admit on the part of government? Is England to supply capital for the Irish manufacturers and agriculturists? Would the supply of such capital be of any effect under the actual condition of the Irish? Is money wanting, or is trade wanting? But do we not in fact actually contribute a portion of this capital? At whose expence are the linen bounties paid? To whom is Ireland indebted for the continuance of this tax, but to the United Kingdom, for her peculiar benefit? In aid of whose manufacture do we further violate every just principle of commercial policy, by a continuation of the transit duties on foreign linen? Upon what principle, except upon that of a free gift to a sister kingdom, can the imposition of such duties, operating as general restraints upon trade, be justified? Is it not in fact so much given to Ireland by England? The Scotch poor are assisted by the sums voted for the completion of the Caledonian Canal and other public works in Scotland. The Irish poor are assisted by the linen bounties, and transit duty on foreign linen.

Nor should it be omitted under this head, that the Irish poor are further assisted by several distinct acts for the improvement and extension of the fisheries on the coast of Ireland. The first and principal of these acts, the 36th Geo III., has been continued and extended by the 59th of the same king. Whilst the progress of just commercial principles has induced the government and legislature of Great Britain to relieve themselves as much as possible of the system of bounties; whilst in some branches of our peculiar industry these bounties have entirely ceased, and in others are gradually reducing, such favor has been afforded to the particular condition of the labouring classes in Ireland, that, with respect to them, the ancient bounties are still continued, and others have been recently superadded and augmented.

It has never escaped the parliament of Great Britain, that, under the erroneous principles of our ancestors a century back, Ireland was called upon to sacrifice her incipient woollen trade, and that the parliament of England then contracted the obligation to favor her linen manufactures. In discharge of this obligation we have always given an exclusive support to this staple manufacture of the sister kingdom. It is unnecessary to call to the remembrance of the Irish manufacturers, what difficulty our merchants have to encounter in forcing the Irish linens on the South American markets, and how urgently the English government has been solicited to make such a change in the present system as would admit the exportation of assorted cargoes.

The next cause of complaint is the absence of all poor-laws. As a cause of distress, there can be no doubt that it is justly alleged; but, under the experience of the effect of these laws in our country, there can surely be no encouragement to extend the same system to Ireland. But the absence of all provision of this kind unquestionably aggravates the condition of the Irish poor. They are not only miserably poor, but are poor without refuge. They have no resort but in mendicancy and vagrancy. Hence another fertile source of internal dissensions, and hence that clannish and congregating spirit common to the Irish of the present day, and to the Scotch of former times. Without fixed residence, without a home, without a parish, and without any circumstances to render them local, or to attach them to a particular spot, they have a natural propensity to herd together in masses, and to form those irregular brotherhoods and societies by which the peace of Ireland is continually assailed. Doubtless this is a very unhappy condition of society; but what remedies does it admit? Is it not one of those general states arising from remote circumstances long continued, which can only be cured by the gradual influence of equal laws, regular government, and by the example and infusion of a more disciplined people? With what justice is this barbarous state of the Irish poor (if so it must be called) to be imputed to the government of England, whose manifest and unquestionable interest it is to remedy it, and who, by local institutions and general laws, have attempted to do so. But the effect of centuries is not to be cured by the regulations of a day: it is totally impossible to civilise a people by act of parliament. All that can be done is done. To the sacrifice of our own interest we consume nearly exclusively the peculiar manufacture of Ireland. In despite of the jealousy of our landed interest, we admit her corn of all kinds equally with that of our own counties. We know no distinction between English and Irish industry. We confine and limit to her the West India market. We force her commodities upon South America. We provoke retaliating prohibitions from the Netherlands by the exclusive admission of her butter and provision trade. To say all in a word, we foster a trade which will not be fostered; we cherish and invite the augmentation of her existing manufactures, and the origination of others: but unhappily we cherish and invite in vain. But to put this question in the strongest point of view—The exports of Ireland, for the year ending January 5th, 1821, to England and all parts of the world, amounted to seven millions; of which portion England alone took more than six millions, and the remainder was the amount of her total exportation to all other quarters of the globe. Such unhappily is the comparative state of English and Irish industry; an effect from causes too deeply rooted to admit of any sudden cure.

The next alleged cause is the effect of illicit distillation.

Unhappily, this feature in the condition of Ireland is sufficiently obvious, and is at once a cause of distress and a circumstance of disorder. But this practice likewise arose from the two peculiar circumstances in the general condition of the Irish population—the non-residence of the native gentry, and the imperfect civilisation of the lower orders. The pernicious propensity to the extravagant use of spirituous liquors always exists strongest in societies approaching nearest to a state of nature. The use of such excitements is the sole remedy for the painful listlessness of savage life. The imperfect civilisation of the Irish poor leads them to this sad resource. The absence of their native gentry removes the supervision and control of their natural protectors. They are thus left to themselves, and follow where the precipitate misery of their condition leads them. But the habits of smugglers are from the outset the habits of outlaws; they become too easily, and by too natural a progress, the habits of more atrocious criminals. There can be no doubt both of the bearing of this cause on the general distress of the country, and of its extent. But, on the part of government, no efforts have been neglected to check the progress of this mischief.

In the year 1820, a bill was introduced into parliament, by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, for extending the practice of Scotland into Ireland, and allowing the use of small legalised stills, of a capacity to contain not less than a hundred gallons, by all persons who should make a proper entry. It is to be hoped that this measure will have the same beneficial effect in Ireland as in Scotland, where it had assisted both landlord and farmer by raising the price of oats and barley, and facilitating the consumption of the produce of those articles in the vicinity. If this measure, and other measures directed against the evil of illicit distillation, should turn out to be nugatory, the fault surely cannot rest with his Majesty's ministers. The principle of this measure was solicited by the Irish members themselves, as the representatives of the public opinion in their own country.

It was only with the same purpose of effectually eradicating this most mischievous practice, that the government so long maintained the salutary measure, originally introduced into the Irish parliament, that of making districts responsible for unlicensed stills discovered within their precincts. But the Irish gentry themselves complained of the extreme severity of this law, and in compliance with the general feeling his Majesty's ministers consented to relax it. The Irish Still Fines Bill was brought in with this purpose. But so sensible were his Majesty's ministers of the real character of this measure, and of its merely partial utility, that they accompanied the introduction of the bill by observations almost protesting against it. But the Irish members insisted, and the bill was accordingly carried. If illicit distillations have since increased, if the stewards, middle-men, and resident factors, of absentee proprietors, have since countenanced this practice—if the produce of the illicit still be employed to pay the exactions of these sub-landlords—if a system of most pernicious toleration, not to say actual connivance, have originated upon a repeal of the old acts—if the charges of the judges, and the exhortation of the superior orders of magistrates, be nullified by the known practice of men of power and influence, immediately resident amongst themselves; if all these evils have arisen from the effectual repeal (for so it may be called) of the old Still Fines Bill, the fault must not at least be imputed to his Majesty's ministers.

The next, and last alleged head, comprehends in substance some loose complaints against the local magistracy of the country, and a more formal recommendation, that government should try the effect of stronger measures. In a brief examination of this head, the enquiry distributes itself into the two points—first, whether stronger measures were required at the period of this recommendation, 1820; and, secondly, whether a state of things may not arise (perhaps has arisen since) which may unquestionably require the introduction of stronger restraints.

In the year 1820 his Majesty's ministers certainly declined the application, on the part of some gentlemen, magistrates of Ireland, to renew the provisions of the Insurrection Act. They saw no necessity for the renewal of this act under the circumstances of those times. The existing statutes appeared to have produced their full effect. The memorials alleged disturbances in Galway, Clare, and Mayo. But the disturbances in Clare and Mayo had been effectually suppressed by the active efforts of the resident gentry. The disturbances in Galway had been more considerable, but they had been suppressed in that country likewise by the concurrent effect of the zealous efforts of the local magistracy, and by the Peace Preservation Bill. Thus government saw no necessity, at that period at least, for any measure required by the failure of the existing acts. Nor was there any thing in the character of these extraordinary measures to recommend their adoption upon their own merits. Experience had taught the true character of this system. If it put down the evil for the present, it cherished its re-appearance with increased malignity for the future. It put out the fire by kicking about the brands. It repressed the disturbance for the time, but provoked retaliating passions, which afterwards broke out with increased outrages. His Majesty's ministers acted under these principles. They saw the necessity of doing something for the Irish people in the way of gradual discipline. It was more consonant with their personal feelings to conciliate than to menace, and amongst means equally efficient for the same end, to prefer those of lenity, moderation, and forbearance.

As to the second point of the question, whether a state of things may not arise to render necessary a resort to stronger measures; it admits only of one answer; that, under the actual state of the country, composed of such elements, a condition of this kind unquestionably may arise. But it will then be time enough to consider the necessity of such measures. Assuredly, unless under circumstances of actual necessity, it would be contrary to the benevolence of government to renew the Insurrection Act. Is it forgotten, that this statute is almost the Curfew act of King William. It forbade the inhabitants of the disturbed districts to be absent from their houses from sun-set to sun-rise. It established a perpetual sessions, composed not of judges, but of magistrates. Every person apprehended might be taken on the spot to this sessions, and, without a grand jury, or a petty jury, on the sole opinion of the magistrate of these sessions, be condemned to transportation for seven years. But will it ever be objected to a British ministry, that under the influence of another system of government, and personally accustomed to an administration upon different principles, they felt a natural reluctance to renew the provisions of an act of this kind, and that they were slow to invest themselves with this tremendous power. If they had consulted only the facility of administration, they would naturally have coveted the possession of a power, which, however severe towards its objects, must necessarily be effectual in its end. If they had consulted only the present interest, the readiest means were the best, and the most powerful were the readiest. But they could not forget that Ireland had suffered much under the erroneus system of former times, and that in the excesses committed by her population, there was much to commiserate, as well as to punish. Upon these principles, the administration of Irish affairs has been directed towards the two objects—of attempting improvements by a gradual return to the ordinary progress of law and government; and applying force only to those occasions, where local disturbances might demand it. If new excesses, and in an alarming degree, should require the renewal of the Insurrection Act, renewed it must be, however the occasion may be lamented.

To any one who will cast his eyes over the history of Irish legislation, for the last twenty years, these remarks will be obvious. From this principle of amelioration by measured steps, and by bringing round the habits of the people to the influence of better morals, as well as of fixed laws, have arisen innumerable acts. By the Irish Peace Preservation Bill, his Majesty's ministers endeavoured to return, by one step, towards the maintenance of public order in Ireland by the ordinary administration of justice. This act was a departure from the severity of the Irish Insurrection Act; retaining so much only of the rigor of that statute, as was unhappily still necessary to restrain the excesses of the disturbed districts. The object of this act was to assimilate, as nearly as possible, the local administration of the law in the two kingdoms. If the local magistracy of Ireland, (it is said, without offence, and speaking only generally, and with numerous exceptions) be still very far removed from the character of the country magistracy in England, the fault is not from any want of effort on the part of his Majesty's ministers, but in that prominent feature in the condition of Ireland—the absence of her great local proprietors. It is impossible for government to work without suitable subject-matter. It is impossible to procure in Ireland the same weight, condition, habits, and respectability, which characterize the magistracy of England. It was under the sense of this inconvenience, that government endeavoured to repair it by a provisional magistracy, appointed from the bar. Here again, is another example of difficulties; the intentions of his Majesty's ministers have been illiberally slandered; this most salutary measure being imputed more to a desire of augmenting their patronage, than of improving the local administration of the laws. The Grand Jury Presentment Bill was a measure of similar character. Its object was to cure an abuse leading to much practical oppression. But a still more useful measure of the same kind, was the sacrifice of government of its ancient appointment of sheriffs of counties. Here, ministers gave up a very important portion of the patronage of the crown. But it is unnecessary to enter into further detail of the numerous measures flowing from the same principle; that of gradually amending the administration of law in Ireland, and of departing, step by step, from that extreme and rigorous system, which had affected the good-will of the two countries.

It is but just however to add, in conclusion of this subject, that none of the present distractions in Ireland can be ascribed to religious differences—Catholics and Protestants are alike sufferers and aggressors. It is but rank faction, therefore, to refer her present state to tythes, taxes, and the absence of a complete Catholic emancipation.

So much upon the general administration of the Home Department. But it would be ungenerous to conclude this part of the subject, without the expression of the public obligation to the Noble Lord, so long at the head of this office. It is surely not too much to say, that in the execution of his arduous, and it must be added, his invidious functions, he has carried the virtues of his private character into the performance of his public duties. In the history of the last ten years, his long administration of this department will be characterized for its lenity, moderation, conciliation, and benevolence. Most truly, his office has been no sinecure. Most truly, it has had nothing of that *secura quies*, that *otium cum dignitate*, which every one must now wish him to enjoy.

The ordinary branches comprehended under this department have been before mentioned. But it has not been mentioned, that this high officer has likewise the administration of the most painful duties of the executive. It belongs to him, in great measure, to designate the objects of punishment and royal clemency. But mercy, like justice, has still the sword for her emblem, and must participate in the invidiousness accompanying the performance of her austere duties. What she spares, is too often forgotten in what she is seen to strike. Her blows make a more forcible appeal to the senses, than the exercise of her lenity and compassion. But is it necessary to insist, that, under the administration of this high officer, this branch of the prerogative has been aided by the feelings and sympathies of private character; and that no one has suffered, whom any public consideration could admit to escape.

COLONIAL DEPARTMENT.

The next division of public business is the Colonial office, which, for the sake of comprehending a more enlarged view of the subject, may be considered in conjunction with the Board of Trade, though not officially belonging to this department.

It has been stated in a former part of these observations, that our colonies admit of a convenient distribution into the two classes, of the Old Colonies and the New Colonies. Without insisting further upon this division, it will be sufficient, as regards the present head, to confine our attention to the three principal subjects of Canada, Jamaica, and the Free Port Islands in the West Indies; adding a few observations upon the Cape of Good Hope, and the Ionian islands. These heads will conveniently embrace the actual principles of our colonial system.

It has been too much the practice of popular writers to undervalue the possession of Canada. Canada is of three main uses to the British Empire—The first, that of constituting a point of contact with the United States; secondly, that of administering to the maintenance of the British navy, by the employment of a large amount of tonnage, and by the formation of seamen in long and rough voyages; and thirdly, that of consuming a very considerable portion of our manufactures.

Under the first of these heads, it has been the policy of successive administrations to regard the possession of Canada as a point of primary importance. It would be ungracious to anticipate events yet hidden behind the clouds of time, and which every man hopes may be of very remote occurrence. But, as empires are not the creatures of the day, political prudence must extend its reach beyond the precautions of a living generation:—*Quid brevi fortes jaculemur ævo*, is not a rule of political wisdom. In the vicissitudes of human affairs, a breach with America is assuredly not an impossible event. But if former statesmen have justified the retention of Gibraltar, a point of much more questionable wisdom, upon the sole ground of its affording a position on the Peninsula, and a port and station in the Mediterranean; and if the experience of the last fifty years has sanctioned this policy; how much stronger is the argument for the same provisional precaution with regard to British America, and the West Indies. In any future war, a large naval force could be promptly applied from this quarter to the American seas. Possibly this may be considered as of no inconsiderable importance.

Under the next head, the seamen and tonnage engaged in trading with Canada are not to be overlooked. They compose a very material proportion in the total amount of our navigation. It has been before mentioned, that the vessels employed in our trade with Canada amount to nearly one-fourth of the tonnage of the British Empire: add to this consideration, her supply of timber in any event of a war with the northern powers of Europe. Under the third head, the consumption of British manufactures in Canada exceeds the amount of the consumption of the East Indies. A further and a final circumstance, not to be omitted, arises from the late American navigation laws. Under the operation of these laws, our West India colonies, without the aid of Canada, would be subjected to great occasional distress. So much as to the importance and value of Canada.

The colony next in order is Jamaica. It has been stated in a former part of these observations, that this colony is of the utmost importance to the revenue, wealth, and navigation, of the British Empire. It is the chief place for the growth of sugar: the corn of the Tropical world, and now become so much an article of necessity throughout civilised Europe, and so largely consumed, that, in value and importance, it occupies the next place to the agricultural produce of our own lands. As regards revenue, the gross receipt of the customs for sugar amounted in the year 1821 to five millions; a sum exceeding by two hundred thousand pounds the gross receipt of the whole revenue for Ireland. As respects its comparison with corn, the gross actual receipt of the excise for all the malt duties of England, in the year 1821, was four millions and a half. The gross actual receipt for the sugar duties, as above stated, exceeded five millions. If we add to this sum the amount of the revenue on the colonial articles of rum, tobacco, and snuff, cocoa-nuts and coffee, pepper, indigo, spices, and drugs, it will appear that the customs and excise on our colonial produce afford little less than eight millions two hundred thousand pounds to the revenue of Great Britain. Now the total of all the sums raised upon the land in Great Britain and Ireland, under the several heads of beer, malt, hops, and land-tax, for the year 1821, was in gross receipt about nine millions. So just is the claim of our sugar colonies, indeed of our colonies in general, to a degree of political relation next only to our landed interest—*nec longo intervallo proximus*. So absurd are all the systems, which, for the temporary purpose of inviting particular attention to one interest only, invidiously exclude and undervalue all others.

Of the total amount of colonial produce, Jamaica alone exports annually one hundred thousand hogsheads of sugar, employing twenty thousand tons of British shipping and five thousand British seamen, and affording two millions net receipt to the revenue of the country. Of such value and importance is Jamaica. As regards the general conduct which has been observed in the civil policy and administration of this colony, suffice it to say, that it has received a protection equivalent to its importance. Whilst a necessary concession to public opinion has compelled his Majesty's ministers to carry the scythe of retrenchment into all the military stations in the empire, and whilst the means of public defence, not to employ stronger terms, have been thus curtailed to a very narrow point, ministers, through all the embarrassments occasioned by this clamor, have retained nearly its original force on the Jamaica station.

The next point for consideration are the Free Ports, so wisely established and enlarged in the West Indies, and particularly those in the Bermuda Islands. Enough has already been said of the general purpose for which these free ports were first established, and with a view to which end they have been continued and extended during peace. It is here sufficient to repeat, that the object of their maintenance is two-fold; the one, reflecting much honor upon the political generosity of the country; the other, more particularly directed to the maintenance and advancement of our own interest. The first of these ends was to afford a more convenient magazine of colonial supply to the United States, and thus to save the people of America the double voyages and expensive freights from that country to Great Britain. This object was necessarily attended with some sacrifice to the interest of our own shipping and navigation, and was so far a departure from our ancient system. But we deemed that friendly states had some claim upon us, and we cheerfully made the concession. The second head of the free port system, which in some degree indemnifies us for the sacrifice under the first, was to promote a larger consumption of West India produce, and to procure a preference for our own colonies. Both these ends have in a great degree been fulfilled. If the passing of the American Navigation Law have cut off the former direct commerce between our West India islands and America, the Bermuda Free Port system has repaired the inconvenience, and the United States may still receive our colonial produce without a voyage to Europe. It is sufficient here to add, that in the colonial administration every facility in practice has been given to this system, and that every regulation has been made to remove impediments to this beneficial intercourse. Possibly, the real and solid advantages of this relaxation from our colonial monopoly will be hereafter much better understood. The system, in its present liberal extent, is new both to our colonies and to the traders of the United States. In our own colonies, a sufficient capital is not perhaps yet embarked to reap the full advantage of a market so calculated to enlarge itself. Possibly, the present decription of traders in these free ports is not exactly qualified to give a due effect to such a system. Larger capitals, and merchants more exercised in the habits of national trade, will necessarily lead to smaller profits and lower prices; and thence to a larger dealing and consumption by the United States. It is impossible not to acknowledge that the frame-work is excellent, and in every respect consistent with liberal policy and just commercial views.

The next subject in order is the Cape of Good Hope—a vineyard, and assuredly, at no distant period, a granary under the most favorable climate in the world. It would be as absurd to judge of the importance of the Cape from what it actually is, as it would be to estimate the value of Virginia and Maryland by what they appear to have been in the time of Charles the Second. The Cape of Good Hope, as an appendage to the British Empire, is in every respect an infant colony. The quality of her vineyards is such as it now exists from the absence only of a due capital and competition. It is impossible to foresee, how far into the interior of Africa the characteristic spirit, activity, and intelligence, of British colonists may push the boundary of this promising settlement. But every new colony, and every augmentation of population and culture in those already possessed, necessarily enlarge the market for the reception of British commerce and manufactures. It is in the very nature of the produce of manufactures to increase from year to year, and to become so depreciated in current price by their excess, as to occasion great distress amongst large bodies of men. It is an object of sound policy to encounter this mischief by precautionary measures. But the only measure of this kind is to provide for a proportionate augmentation of consumption. It is under this principle, that no efforts have been spared by our colonial administration to assist the culture and population of our new colonies. The emigrants to the Cape were sent with this view; they were *selected* with this view. Happily the present condition of this colony affords no subject of further remark. Under the general administration of the Colonial Department, and the exemplary execution of their duties by the local authorities, no settlement of this great empire affords a more cheerful aspect.

The same attentive consideration has been given to the state of the Ionian Islands. We have faithfully fulfilled our duties as their protector;—we have purified, as much as in us lay, the inveterate evils of the old administration;—we have raised the character of the inferior classes of the people, and have reduced the feudal chiefs to obedience of the laws. They no longer afford the most disgraceful spectacle in the midst of civilised Europe—a people without law, private morals, or public honor. In process of time we may contribute as much to their culture and commerce, as we have already done to their laws and morals. A promising fruit trade may hereafter become of proportionate importance to our foreign trade.

BOARD OF TRADE.

It will not require a long examination to show that the Board of Trade has performed its duties to the public, and that the industry, manufactures, and commerce of the country have received many solid benefits from its deliberate attention. These services may be distributed under the general heads of the Navigation Acts, the Warehousing System, the removal of numerous prohibitions and impediments under the Restrictive and Protective Statutes, an augmentation of the sphere of the Colonial Trade and of British Commerce, and the simplification of the laws relating to Forfeiture, Regulation, and Customs.

Under the head of Navigation Laws, the board has been long occupied in a most useful and laborious investigation of the complicate system of these statutes. The result of its labors has been the preparation of several measures, which will probably become acts of the legislature in the session now ensuing. The enactments of these laws will possibly confer more upon British commerce than it has received within the last hundred years. They will assist the business of the general merchant; they will advance the trade and commerce of the country, foreign, colonial, and domestic; they will remove much grudge and jealousy in foreign nations, without any proportionate sacrifice of our own peculiar interests.

It of course does not fall within the possible purpose of a short pamphlet to enter into a review of the involved and laborious system of our Navigation Laws; but, in justice to the labors of this department and its able presidents, a few observations are required, and a few only will be sufficient to explain their public services under this part of the subject.

It is scarcely necessary to premise, except for the sake of order, that British Commerce, with reference to the Navigation Laws, is distributed into the five heads: the European trade, the trade to Asia, Africa, and America, not being colonial—the Colonial trade, the Coasting trade, and the Fisheries. The Navigation System is composed of a class of rules arranged under these titles, and applicable to each. With respect to the European trade, the rule is, that all goods, the produce of Europe, shall be imported into England in three species of ships only—in British built ships; in ships of the build of the country or place of which such goods are the growth; or in ships of the build of the port or place which is the usual place of the shipment of such goods. With respect to the trade beyond Europe, not being colonial, the general rule is: that the growth or manufacture of such country can be imported only *direct* in British ships; such importation to be made either from the place of growth or manufacture, or from the usual place of shipment only. The three rules of the Colonial trade, Coasting trade, and Fisheries, are merely exclusive of all ships but those of British build and ownership. Such, speaking in general terms, is the outline of our Navigation System.

But however wise the general system of these laws, and most wise has it been proved by the experience of its effects, the exact and rigid application of all the above rules has been attended with particular mischief pressing hardly upon general trade. The first rule, for example, consists of two parts, the former of which confines the importation of European goods to British ships, to ships of the build of the country, and to ships of the build of the usual place of shipment. By a second part of this rule, an invidious and most groundless exception is made against the produce of Holland and the Netherlands; certain articles of which are prohibited to be imported in any ships whatever. It is indeed true, that these exceptions, originating in particular feelings against Holland at the time the acts were passed, have been much reduced by subsequent statutes. But it is equally true, that enough of these jealous restrictions still remains to create embarrassment in trade, and to excite an angry feeling in a friendly people. Many goods are prohibited from Ostend, which may come from Calais; and, more absurdly still, many goods may come from Calais, which would be forfeited, coming from Dunkirk. Again, under the rule of the trade beyond Europe, not being colonial, British ships can bring the produce of such countries from the place of their production, or place of usual shipment, *directly* only. "Hence," as well observed by the able Vice President of the Board of Trade, in his eloquent speech in the House of Commons, upon this subject, "if a British ship finds in an American, an African, or an Asiatic port, articles the produce of any of the other quarters of the world, however convenient for its assortment, or market, such ship is prohibited from receiving and carrying them, under the penalty of confiscation of ship and cargo, on its arrival in a British port." Again, the rule of the European trade confines, as above said, the importation of European produce to British ships, or ships of the country of production. By the effect of this rule, it becomes totally impossible for a foreign merchant, trading from a port abroad, to send an assorted cargo to a British port, inasmuch as the goods of each country require a separate ship. Such in practice are the main actual inconveniences under our existing navigation laws.

The labors of the Board of Trade, and of its most intelligent President and Vice President, have been directed, in the first instance, to apply a remedy to these particular defects of a system so generally excellent. Accordingly, under a course of persevering industry, a bill will probably be passed in the ensuing session, which will remove these heads of grievance, common to ourselves and foreign nations; and will so simplify the general system of our navigation laws, as greatly to facilitate foreign and domestic commerce. Under the proposed clauses of this bill, the invidious and useless exceptions respecting Holland and the Netherlands will doubtless be repealed. British ships will be enabled to bring cargoes from any port or place of Asia, Africa, and America, not being colonial, without the useless and mischievous restriction of such cargoes being the produce of the place only from which they are brought. And still more importantly, and with a promise of much future benefit to general commerce, foreign merchants will be enabled to bring assorted cargoes in the European trade.

The subject next in order and importance is the Warehousing system.

The object of this system, and of the new measures proposed to parliament under it, is to invite the deposit of foreign commodities, of every description, in British warehouses; for the purpose of enabling British and foreign ships, departing from the ports of this country, to take assorted cargoes, and thus to carry on a general exportation trade to every part of the world; subject, however, to the regulations necessary for the security of the revenue, and for preserving to our own manufacturers a just preference in our own markets. If this system be not entirely new, it is new at least in the extent and liberality in which the Board of Trade now proposes its adoption. This depôt or transit system was first introduced into practice by the 43d of the late King. But this statute, like all other incipient measures, has a strong infusion of the jealousy of the times in which it was ventured; and whilst it recognises the principle, proceeds with much timidity and hesitation in the practice. Whilst it admits the importation of raw produce and materials, it excludes under this jealous feeling almost every species of foreign manufactured goods. The reason of this restriction was doubtless in the apprehension of assisting the competition of foreign manufacturers with our own dealers in foreign markets. But the employment of such means for such an end is as nugatory as it is mischievous. It is mischievous, because it deprives us of the incalculable advantage of becoming the general magazine of the world, and of superadding the profits of general trade to those resulting from dealing only in our own manufactures. It is nugatory, because, in the present state of European nations, no prohibitions of this kind can prevent foreigners from supplying themselves from the best mart. The sole security for preference to British manufacturers is in their own superior skill, intelligence, and activity; in their vast accumulated capital, and in a magnitude and quality of machinery, the growth, like our capital, of a hundred years of successful commerce. All other means are accessible by all, and will be employed by all. Under such considerations, it has been the laborious effort of the Board of Trade to relieve the general commerce of the country from this restrictive system, and to awaken our manufacturers to just views of their own interests. Such is the object of the Warehousing bill.[1]

The subject next in order and importance for the consideration of the Board was such a new arrangement of the Timber duties, as might reconcile the fair claims of our North American colonists, and our British ship-owners, with the interests of general commerce, and with the reasonable expectations of friendly nations. To this subject the Board, in common with his majesty's ministers, directed its most laborious attention; and the result was the Act of the last session of parliament, by which this object has been effected. It is scarcely necessary to observe, that the former duties upon timber had been imposed in the year 1809, when our naval resources were menaced by the effect of the French decrees. Under these circumstances, an offer had been made to government, by some merchants and ship-owners, to supply the necessary timber from Canada, if the employment of their capital were secured by protecting duties. His majesty's ministers accepted the offer, but with the distinct understanding, that the duties should only be temporary; and that upon the conclusion of the war, or the occurrence of another state of things, the continuance or repeal of these duties should be open to the consideration of parliament. Upon this subject, his majesty's ministers have surely a just claim to the praise of not having sacrificed general principles to the urgency of a temporary embarrassment. Their hands were untied when the occasion was favorable. Accordingly, they were then enabled to consider this system of preference upon its own merits. On the one side, were the interests of the colonists, the capitals of the ship-owners actually employed, and the national objects of our naval resources, and our navigation laws. On the other side, were the undeniable interests of the general trader, and the fair expectations of the northern powers of Europe. In the recent act of parliament, it is presumed that these objects are consulted in a degree due to their several importance. It is always a matter of great practical difficulty to repeal a protective system. This difficulty is not wholly removed by the circumstance of Government having acted with due foresight and precaution, and having reserved to itself the full *right* to make the repeal. The difficult question of prudence still intervenes. Much actual capital is necessarily employed; great interests adapt themselves to existing channels of trade; adventure and speculation imprudently extend their prospect beyond the licensed limit. The boundary itself, depending upon the duration of a fluctuating state of things, is perhaps, as in this case, uncertain; and the error of expatiating beyond the line granted belongs rather to reasonable expectation, than to unwarranted folly. If ministers had to contend with these difficulties, let them rather receive the just praise of having done so much, than incur any reprehension that they have been unable to do more. It is one thing to prune, and another to cut down. It is one thing to perform a simple operation, and another to meddle with a principle or movement in a piece of complicate machinery, so connected in all its joints, that a new modification introduced into one part renders it necessary to carry a new relative adaptation throughout the whole. All amendments in our commercial system are necessarily of this nature. We have not to repair a movement, but to re-construct a machine.

---

[1] For a more detailed view of the Navigation and Warehousing system, and the proposed amendments, the reader is referred to the most able speech of the Right Hon. T. Wallace, Vice-president of the Board of Trade, made in the House of Commons, June, 1821.

The next subject of consideration was the possible augmentation of our export trade from and to India. His majesty's ministers were most anxious to effect this important purpose, and they afforded a most earnest attention to every sober proposal upon it. It is true, that their expectations were less sanguine than those of the popular advocates for this increase. A large mutual consumption of produce and manufactures can only occur between nations of the same general wants and habits. The largest dealer with a manufacturing nation is, necessarily, a people of the same original habits with itself, but which people, from the effect of some incidental circumstance, are in a different stage of social progress. Hence, the largest customer of England is America; her people having the same objects of comfort, convenience, and luxury, with the natives of Great Britain; but being as yet only in the agricultural state of society, they necessarily find it more profitable to confine their own industry to the growth of raw produce, and to take their manufactures from England. But the relative state of England and the East Indies is precisely the contrary. A people of a temperate latitude, and a people of the tropics; a highly civilised people, and a nearly barbarous people; a people living only on rice, and abstaining from animal food, and a people pursuing luxury through all its endless variety. A people without the means, almost the desire, of applying to any use either the growth of our soil, or the produce of our manufactures. A people, by the immense population of their country, and the simplicity of their habits, working up their own raw produce so cheaply, as almost to render it a moral miracle, that the machinery of Europe can compete in any slight degree with their hand-work. A people, in fine, to whom the glass, leather, paper, printed goods, earthenware, salt, soap, spirits, wine, cutlery, and woollens of Europe, must be all nearly totally useless. Under such circumstances, it is impossible to anticipate any large consumption amongst the millions of our Indian population. In fact, the main consumption in India of European manufacture is, and always must be, by her own European subjects. But so long as India, under the policy of the Company, shall continue to be a factory, her European consumption will be that of a factory only. It is a waste of words to insist longer upon a principle so obvious. These considerations, doubtless, pressed with a due force upon the minds of his majesty's ministers. They could not resist the conclusion, that not only under present circumstances, but under circumstances at least half a century to come, they must not anticipate any considerable augmentation in our exports to the East Indies. But they deemed it a duty to concede to the sanguine representations of the mercantile and shipping interests. Accordingly, by a recent act, they have established a direct trade between India and Europe, and have opened it to the private trader as well as to the Company. By this measure, they have accomplished all within their power for the possible establishment of an active and adventurous trade, directly from the ports of the East Indies to those of Europe. The treaty with the United States of America, and their admission under that treaty to our ports in the East Indies, had already paved the way for the establishment of this active commerce; and was infusing into our Indian settlements that large mercantile and adventurous spirit, which is possibly the only promising means for the gradual civilisation, and for the formation into European habits, of that vast member of our empire. Our own traders became, pardonably enough, but perhaps unreasonably, jealous of the activity of the commerce between India and Europe by means of American vessels. The new act remedies this alleged mischief. Our own traders may now supply Europe directly with the produce of India. In process of time, this opening may lead to important results. But upon such a subject it is impossible to anticipate the events of futurity. There can exist but one wish upon it.

The next head for the consideration of the Board, was the proposed new system for the equal admission of French wines with those of Portugal. Enough has already been said upon the general nature of this proposition in a former part of these observations. It has been before observed, that the value of the Brazil trade must now be comprehended in that of Portugal; and that the addition of this large component portion of her empire, has raised the value of our Portuguese trade from its former annual value of about six hundred thousand pounds to four millions. Before the opening of the Brazils to British commerce, the annual value of the British exports to Portugal did not reach to half their present amount. Since our free admission into the Brazils, our annual exports under the head of Portuguese trade have attained to four millions.

If the preference of Portugal to France, by the Methuen treaty, were considered as a just policy under the former condition of our Portuguese trade, how much strength has the affirmative of this question received, when, as at present, the introduction of the Brazils into the sphere of British commerce has so greatly augmented the value of this trade!

The trade, moreover, between Great Britain and Portugal does not now stand alone upon the Methuen treaty. The basis of this commerce has been enlarged by the treaty with Portugal, of 1810; by an act of parliament passed to confirm it, and by the repeal of certain provisions of our navigation act in order to carry it into effect. By the 51st of George the Third, the produce, raw and manufactured, of the Portuguese colonies in South America, is allowed to be imported into Great Britain directly, in their own ships. This is a relaxation of the third section of the Navigation act, which prohibits all importations from the continents of Asia, Africa, and America, except in British-built vessels only.

If the advocates for the proposed new system appear to undervalue our commerce with Portugal, they appear equally to over-rate the probable advantages of an augmented mercantile intercourse with France. The experiment has been tried; and if it has not altogether failed, the result has certainly not been such as to recommend an experiment so costly as that of putting to peril our Portuguese and Brazilian commerce.

In 1787, Mr. Pitt actually made the experiment, by a most considerable reduction on the duties of French wines. The sanguine expectations of the British merchants under this new system wholly failed. Under its operation, our exports to France never exceeded seven hundred thousand pounds annually. The causes of this failure are indeed perfectly intelligible. France has the same common commercial objects with ourselves. Her government has to protect its own manufactures, her silks, her cottons, her woollens, her own hardware, and her own produce. We possess nothing so peculiar to ourselves as are her wines to France; and we have therefore nothing of which France is in either absolute want, or to which her government can give a preference, without a proportionate sacrifice from their own subjects. Under such circumstances, it is nearly impossible that our exports to France can much exceed their actual amount. These reflections have doubtless possessed their due weight upon the Board of Trade; and if nothing has been done under this head, but a most attentive consideration of the reports made by parliamentary committees upon foreign trade, it is because the subject is full of the most extreme difficulty and embarrassment.

Such therefore is the general state of the nation under the several departments in which the public business appears more conveniently to arrange itself. Under the department of Finance, it has been made to appear, that from the year 1816 to the present period ministers have persevered in a continued course of reduction and retrenchment. In the year 1816, the total of the annual expenditure for army, navy, ordnance, and miscellaneous, the four main heads of the public annual service, was twenty-four millions eight hundred and eighty-seven thousand pounds. The total for the same services for 1821 was eighteen millions. A reduction of nearly seven millions annual expenditure. But it is unnecessary to repeat what has been so amply explained in a former part of these observations. Suffice it to say under the summary of finance, that, through every branch of the public service, the retrenchment has been as sincere as effectual. A few weeks only will pass before the country will acknowledge, that this solicitude to reduce the burthens of the people, and to relieve the commerce, agriculture, and manufactures of the kingdom, has not relaxed since the conclusion of the last session of parliament, and that more has since been reduced in every department of the public service, than any reasonable expectation could anticipate. As regards the reduction, indeed, made in one branch of the public service, the difficulties of ministers have possibly changed their aspect. Instead of having to excuse the actual expenditure, they will hereafter have to justify the attempted reduction.

But his majesty's ministers do not require to be informed, that, under a free constitution like our own, the value of public opinion is not to be overlooked. If it be the character of a light and inconstant mind to be diverted from the performance of grave and invidious duties by a mistaken popular clamor, it is no less a measure of prudence not to undervalue the aid of public opinion. It is equally an extreme to follow wheresoever the popular tempest may drive; or purposely to take a course in its teeth, where both prudence and virtue allow the use of its concurrent aid. It happily belongs to the nature of a free government and an intelligent people, that public opinion is never long misled. What the first statesman, as well as the first orator of the Roman empire, observed of the nature of general truth, is equally just with regard to the particular truths of human conduct:—*Opinionum commenta delet dies, naturæ judicia confirmat.* Parties and prejudices pass away, whilst the effects of wise and moderate measures necessarily enter into the future weal of the state, and, in their visible good, make an effectual, though perhaps tardy appeal, to the gratitude of a generous nation.

Whilst the administration of the finances is entitled to the praise of a just economy, the integrity of all the great national resources must excite the warm satisfaction of every well-wisher to his country. Under all the heads of these resources—our foreign trade, our internal trade and manufactures, our internal consumption—and the correspondence of our revenue with our expenditure, the general aspect is such as to excite satisfaction for the present, and a just confidence for the future. Of the three main branches of our foreign commerce, our European trade, our trade with the United States, and our trade with Asia, Africa, and America, not being colonial, the first holds forth an actual considerable increase; the second justifies the expectation of a speedy return to its former large amount; whilst the third already exceeds every reasonable expectation. If we follow the natural order of the component members of our European commerce, our trade with Portugal, including the Brazils, has augmented from two millions to four millions. The political state of Spain has affected in some degree its external relations; but her exclusive tariff has been in great part recalled, and our dealings with her, under the circumstance of our own wool-tax, exceed what could reasonably be anticipated. Our commerce with France, Holland, the Netherlands, and Germany, equals the average amount of any former year. If our exportation of colonial produce to the continent of Europe be not so great in amount as during some of the war years, and the two years following immediately on the peace, the cause is in the resumption by foreign states of their own colonies. It will be found, however, that our exportation of raw sugar is greatly on the increase; whilst our refined sugars have gradually advanced, since the year 1814, from one million and a half to two millions; and our export of cotton yarn has increased during the same period from little more than one million annually to two millions two hundred thousand pounds.

Our brass and copper manufactures have nearly doubled their amount. Our export of iron still retains the Mediterranean market, and, under the effect of a great increasing demand and consumption, both foreign and domestic, is becoming one of the staples of the country, and an almost equal rival of Swedish iron in quality. Our woollen manufactures will be found on an average of the last five years to exceed the like average during the best years of the war; whilst our gross exports of cotton manufactures, now forming our principal export to the continent of Europe as well as to America, have advanced from sixteen to twenty-one millions.

Our commerce with the United States has been necessarily affected by the diminished means of this great consumer. The seller has necessarily suffered by the impaired wealth of the principal buyer. But under the extent and variety of her soil and produce, under the elastic spirit, the unwearied activity, and the invincible industry, of her citizens (the *vis insita originis* of this British scion,) the government of the United States is rapidly returning to its former condition; and as our commerce shared in the late reverses, so is it participating in her happier restoration. The American revenue from customs, in the year 1819, was about seventeen millions of dollars. In 1820 it approached towards twenty millions. Upon making up the accounts to the close of the present year, it may be calculated from all credible report to exceed twenty-two millions. Our commerce with Asia, Africa, and America, not being colonial, though very considerable at present, is still greater in prospect than in possession. Fortune has here thrown up the vast and unbroken field of South American commerce.

The opening of the East India trade, and the recent extension of the privileges of the private traders, have laid the basis of a commerce, which the activity and enterprise of British merchants will push to an incalculable extent. We see this trade almost in its infancy; but it must not be forgotten, that it was his majesty's present ministers who opened it to the general merchant.

The general character of our internal trade and manufactures affords a spectacle no less splendid and grateful. The just criterion of their actual condition is in the state of our current consumption. But through every branch of this consumption, whether affecting necessaries, conveniencies, or luxuries, there is the same indisputable argument of the continuing opulence of the country. In tea, coffee, tobacco, malt, and British spirits, salt, leather, candles, soap, bricks, tiles, &c. the current consumption maintains at least the average of former years, and under most of the above heads exceeds it. The proof in detail of this proposition has been given in a former part of these observations. Suffice it here to call the attention of the reader to a most important conclusion:—Of the twenty-six millions annually produced by the excise, the amount of the taxes upon fermented liquors and their materials, added to those of tea, coffee, and tobacco only, exceed twenty millions. Of so much consequence is the continuing domestic consumption of these articles which, though thus few in amount, exceed by more than two-fold the produce of our customs.

Whilst such is the condition of our foreign commerce, internal trade, manufactures, and revenue, the administration of our foreign relations has in every respect upholden the honor of the country, and confirmed our national security under the general treaties of Europe. In the local contentions of European powers, we have at once respected the independence of nations, and retained entire our own friendly relations. Under a laudable prudence we have contented ourselves with the performance of our own duties, and have seen no obligation unnecessarily to involve the country by the hostile assertion of principles not proportionately affecting ourselves. The event has justified our policy. Our wise forbearance has saved us from the humiliation of a vain ostentation of our power, and from the costly prosecution of remote interests. Under this system, all our foreign relations with friendly states continue unimpaired. In Europe, Asia, and America, we have a voice or a vote proportionate to the dignity of our empire, and to the reputation of our strength, wisdom, and moderation.

Under our Home Department, may it not be fearlessly asserted by the friends of his Majesty's ministers, that the general aspect of Great Britain, so far as regards the public tranquillity, is every thing which the most ardent lover of his country could desire. The administration of the laws is no longer interrupted by factious clamors against the local magistracy of the country. The essential and strongest interests of all societies, religion, morals, and public peace; are secured by laws, formidable only to the guilty, and operating upon them more by a salutary intimidation and restraint than by an actual application. No one at the present day, either singly by himself, or as the leader of a field-mob, can any longer defy the laws of the state, or calumniate its most sacred institutions. The state, or any of its corporate orders, may apply with security to the juries of the country. If the condition of the sister-kingdom be not equally satisfactory, it is matter perhaps rather of regret for the present than of just apprehension for the future. It is impossible but that her misguided peasantry must shortly return to the protection of a paternal government.

Under the head of the Colonial Department, and the general administration of our shipping and mercantile interests by the Board of Trade, every person connected with these objects cannot refuse to acknowledge his obligations to his Majesty's ministers. If Canada, in common with the United States, suffer under the operation of our corn-laws, she suffers from the necessity of the supreme government not to sacrifice a greater interest in favor of one of minor consideration. It is not that Canada is sacrificed to Great Britain, but that Great Britain cannot be sacrificed to Canada. Under circumstances of the most obvious policy, we withhold from our Canadian subjects not a right but a grace. But where is the person amongst us who, under the existing depression of British agriculture, can venture to propose any relaxation of the prohibitory system? If the amount of colonial corn be not considerable, there prevails still a current opinion, mistaken, perhaps, but certainly popular, that any excess in the market, however small, affects the value of the whole quantity in a proportion far greater than its own amount. But there are circumstances, in which it is necessary to concede to impressions probably erroneous, and certainly exceeding the just measure of their causes. Our immense interests in Jamaica are placed in a state of security beyond apprehension. The free ports in Malta and the Mediterranean are extending the sphere of the colonial markets into the Greek islands and the Turkish empire. Under an intelligent system of administration we are eradicatingall the vices of an old vicious government in the Ionian Islands, and are gradually raising that power to a certain station in the political and commercial system of Europe. The Cape of Good Hope holds forth a fair promise of great future advantage, whilst New South Wales already assists the merchants and manufacturers of the mother country: her fine wool already excels that of Saxony and Spain, and when assisted by a larger capital, and by a more intelligent culture, may possibly reach the British market at such a moderate price, as greatly to abridge the necessity of foreign importation. The direct trade from India to Europe is receiving every assistance from government and the Board of Control. If we cannot reap all that is expected from the free trade between England and the East Indies, it at least will not be imputed to the indifference or negligence of his Majesty's ministers that we have not got all that we could. But Hope has necessarily a longer reach than Possibility.

The beneficial labors of the Board of Trade will be better understood when they enter more distinctly into our practical ssystem. But two of the benefits of this branch of the public service to general commerce are sufficiently large, and sufficiently above the surface, to appeal with effect to every mercantile eye.

The enlargement of the transit and warehousing system; the opening of the ports of the country, so as to render them the depôt and emporium of foreign commodities of every kind; the assisting our own merchants to take assorted cargoes of foreign and domestic goods, and the enabling foreign merchants to employ our ship-owners as carriers of foreign produce from British ports, will be most important contributions to the general commerce of the country, and must greatly extend our navigation and carrying trade, and the sale and consumption of our own manufactures. The consolidation and simplification of our Navigation Laws, with the revision and suppression of some of the obsolete enactments, will equally facilitate mercantile business at home, and conciliate the good-will of foreigners. A third object of the recent labors of this Board—a revision of the lights, harbour-dues, and pilotage, and, in due time, of the dock-system, which now press so heavily both upon British and foreign shipping, will, it is presumed, become a boon equally acceptable to the mercantile and shipping interests.

A last effort of the Board of Trade, in concurrence with the ministers, who direct and assist its operations, and in which it is to be hoped they will succeed in the course of the ensuing session, is the revision and amendment of the prohibitory system in general, and the substitution of protecting duties in exchange for the existing actual prohibitions. This object, or the attempt at least, has long been in favor with every good and moral man, and possesses the strong recommendation of being equally adapted to advance the interests of our revenue, and to cut off a source of much vice and misery. Under the known operation of wealth and luxury, and of the vanity and emulation to which they lead, prohibitions of articles of foreign manufacture excite only a more determined purpose to possess them. Their cost renders them a distinction, and vanity is, perhaps, as coarse as hunger in its food and fuel. The difficulty enhances only the price, and the large reward creates and animates the spirit of smuggling. Hence the prohibition is productive of little other consequence, as regards the high and opulent classes, but that of exciting in them a spirit in opposition to itself; and of creating, maintaining, and highly rewarding, the criminal occupation of the smuggler, and all the immoral habits connected with a life of outrage against the laws. But substitute protecting duties, and you avoid all this mischief, and at the same time effect the object of the prohibition. The opulent classes will pay the high prices under the protecting duties, as they pay the smuggler, but the revenue will gain the advantage, and not the illicit trader. The fair dealer loses nothing, as, under the prohibiting or protecting system, the present consumers will equally have the articles; and under both can have them only at the same high price; but the government and the public morals gain. Smuggling must nearly cease, and with it the large cost of the present preventive system.

Such, therefore, is the general condition of public affairs with which we have to enter upon the commencement of a new year.

After this brief and plain statement of what has been done, and what has been omitted, and through what difficulties, and under what embarrassments, is it too much for a candid observer to conclude, that his Majesty's ministers are fully entitled to the praise of a zealous performance of all their public duties; and are so much the more justly entitled to this praise from a generous and discerning public, inasmuch as they have themselves declined to vindicate or assert their just and obvious claims. Is it too much to say, that there is something peculiarly grateful to the English character in this effectual prosecution of business without pretension—in this sober, steady, victory over the most appalling difficulties, without the levity and vanity of a triumph? Is it unreasonable to express a confident assurance, that the future annalist, if not the passing generation, will recognise the public obligation to the ministers of George the Fourth, and will hereafter enumerate them among those wise and substantial, but unpretending and untalking benefactors, who in times of great peril and difficulty—in times of much vaporing and frothiness—when every popular leader has his new measure, and all the infinite variety of political wisdom is reduced into theories—when every one assumes to be the builder of a system, and every stone is marked with the builder's name—when British officers follow in the train of a mob against the police of the country, and wise men come from the East to show how cheaply a nation can be governed—is it too much to claim for his Majesty's ministers the praise of those, who, *nihil non agentes quod reipublicæ necesse fuit, et sine ulla ostentatione agendi,* deserve the more applause from others, as, under the most unequivocal public services, they least assume it for themselves. *De Agrippa et Mæcenate qui postea judicabunt, sentiendum et prædicandum est, vix quosque reperiri posse, qui, in tantis rerum periculis, tam multa et magna, et cum tam minimâ perturbatione hominum atque rerum, pro Senatu Populoque Romano, re atque actu fecerunt.*

THE

RETURN TO NATURE;

OR,

A DEFENCE

OF THE

VEGETABLE REGIMEN;

WITH SOME ACCOUNT OF AN EXPERIMENT MADE DURING THE
LAST THREE OR FOUR YEARS IN THE AUTHOR'S FAMILY.

> Man, only man, Creation's Lord confess'd,
> Amidst his happy realm remains unbless'd;
> On the bright earth, his flow'r-embroider'd throne,
> Th' imperial mourner reigns and weeps alone.
>
> SPENCER'S YEAR OF SORROW.

BY JOHN FRANK NEWTON, ESQ.

[*Continued from No. XXXVIII. p. 530.*]

LONDON:

1822.

DEFENCE, &c.

DISEASE.

THE name of my apothecary is Verlander, and he lives at Knightsbridge. I never in my life had a medicine chest, and from no person but Mr. Verlander has medicine of any sort been purchased during the above period, for the seven persons in question. The reader will see that spirits of wine to burn under coffee, and a bottle to contain them, are the only items of charge in this account. I may be mistaken, but I am persuaded that there is scarcely another instance in this never-ending metropolis, of three grown persons and four young children under nine years of age, incurring an expense of sixpence only for medicine and medical attendance in the course of two years;[1] and that single charge was not made for either of the children, but for myself. This result is exactly what would be expected from the remarkably healthy appearance of the young people alluded to, which is so striking, that several medical men who have seen and examined them with a scrutinising eye, all agreed in the observation that they knew no where a whole family which equals them in robustness. Should the success of this experiment, now of three years standing, proceed as it has begun, there is little doubt, I presume, that it must at length have some influence with the public, and that every parent who finds the illnesses of his family both afflicting and expensive, will say to himself, "Why should I any longer be imprudent and foolish enough to have my children sick?" All hail to the resolution which that sentence implies! But until it becomes general,

---

[1] This fact has been repeated in Dr. Lambe's family, where it has this additional importance, that the children were much older than mine when they adopted the regimen of vegetables and distilled water.

I feel it necessary to exhort in the warmest language I can think of, those who have young people in their charge, to institute an experiment which I have made before them with the completest success. To those domestic parents especially do I address myself, who, aware that temperance in enjoyment is the best warrant of its duration, feel how dangerous and how empty are all the feverous amusements of our assemblies, our dinners, and our theatres, compared with the genuine and tranquil pleasures of a happy little circle at home. Oh, if they knew the blessing of never hearing one's children restless at night to those who sleep in the midst of them; or of seeing one month, one year of vigor, uniformly succeed another! The health of mine may be verified by the inspection of any strangers who shall be disposed to take that trouble. And surely it is to be presumed, that their little ones also will be no less exempt from violent attacks, after two or three years' perseverance in a similar plan; that their forms will expand, their strength increase, in a very different ratio from the ordinary one: that the little family perturbations occasioned by the falls of children, which are in great measure attributable to the want of tone in their fibre, will be almost unknown; that as the fracture of limbs, like the rupture of blood vessels, is more owing to the state of the body than to the violence of the shock encountered, they will be infinitely less liable to such distressing accidents; that their irritability, and consequently their objurgatory propensities, will gradually subside; that they will become not only more robust, but more beautiful; that their carriage will be erect, their step firm; that their development at a critical period of youth, the prematurity of which has been considered an evil, will be retarded: that above all, the danger of being deprived of them will in every way diminish; while by these light repasts their hilarity will be augmented, and their intellects cleared, in a degree which shall astonishingly illustrate the delightful effects of this regimen.

How can I any longer repress the strong desire I feel, of addressing a few words to Him who has discovered a remedy for the groans and the vices of mankind, where other instructed and powerful minds have despaired. "Perbibisti nequitiam, et ita visceribus immicuisti, ut *nisi cum ipsis* exire non possit."

SENECA, DE IRA.

"Thou hast drank deep at the fountain of iniquity, and so incorporated the stream with your viscera—with your very vitals—that *except with them*, it can never escape from thee." Such was the disturbed and hopeless exclamation of the philosophic Seneca; and his reproach, *if a reproach it really is*, embraces alike the whole human race. But it is thy great office, thou true physician, to repair the general health by this material and legitimate course; and by rendering the body sound, to restore mankind to their moral and intellectual liberty; a labor which Jove of old deemed worthy of Hercules, when he commissioned him to release the tortured hero from his chains, and suspend the horrors inflicted by the sinewy Vulture of Mount Caucasus.

I will beg leave to tempt an answer in this place to that trite and specious objection to Dr. Lambe's opinions, that "What suits one constitution may not suit another." If there be a single person existing whose health would not be improved by the vegetable diet and distilled water, then the whole system falls at once to the ground. The question is simply, Whether fruits and other vegetables be not the natural sustenance of man, who would have occasion for no other drink than these afford, and whose thirst is at present excited by an unnatural flesh diet, which causes his disorders, bodily and mental? In the southern climates, in which the heat might give a greater tendency to thirst, where can there be found a more delicious beverage to those who have preserved any simplicity of taste, than the juice of the orange, or the milk of

[1] "Bear me, Pomona, to thy citron groves;
To where the lemonand the piercing lime,
With the deep orange glowing thro' the green,
Their lighter glories blend. Lay me reclin'd
Beneath the spreading tamarind that shakes,
Fann'd by the breeze, its fever-cooling fruit.
Deep in the night the massy locust sheds
Quench my hot limbs: or lead me thro' the maze,
Embowering endless, of the Indian fig:
Or, thrown at gayer ease, on some fair brow,
Let me behold, by breezy murmurs cool'd,
Broad o'er my head the verdant cedar wave,
And high palmetos lift their graceful shade.
Or stretch'd amid these orchards of the sun,
Give me to drain the cocoa's milky bowl,
And from the palm to draw its freshening wine!
More bounteous far than all the frantic juice
Which Bacchus pours. Nor on its slender twigs
Low bending, be the full pomegranate scorn'd;
Nor, creeping thro' the woods, the gelid race
Of berries. Oft in humble station dwells
Unboastful worth, above fastidious pomp.
Witness, thou best Anana, thou the pride
Of vegetable life, beyond whate'er
The poets imag'd in the golden age:
Quick let me strip thee of thy tufty coat,
Spread thy ambrosial stores, and feast with Jove!"
THOMSON'S SUMMER, line 663.

"With candy'd plantains, and thejuicy pine,
On choicest melons and sweet grapes they dine;

the cocoa-nut? in which last it is worth our observation, that one of the three dark circular marks at the end of each nut is always so soft, that in the most unassisted state of man he would easily extract liquor within, by passing a large thorn or a piece of stick through the spot above-mentioned.

Another objection sometimes urged is this: "If children brought up on a vegetable regimen, should at a future period of their lives adopt a meat diet, they will certainly suffer more from the change than they otherwise would have done." The very contrary of this remark is, I conceive, what would happen. The stomach is so fortified by the general increase of health, that a person thus nourished is enabled to bear what one whose humors are less pure may sink under. The children of our family can each of them eat a dozen or eighteen walnuts for supper without the most trifling indigestion, an experiment which those who feed their children in the usual manner would consider it adventurous to attempt. So also the Irish porters in London bear their alteration of diet successfully, and owe much of their actual vigor to the vegetable food of their forefathers, and to their own, before they emigrated from Ireland, where in all probability they did not taste meat half a dozen times in the year.

I have heard it objected, in the third place, that "If meat were not proper food for us, we should not in all probability be so inclined to use it, nor would the flavor be so agreeable to us: and that if we cannot bear to eat it until it has undergone certain preparations, still it is our nature to be ingenious, and to adapt our processes, whether culinary or any other, to our occasions."

And with potatoes fat their wanton swine.
Nature these cates with such a lavish hand
Pours out among them, that our coarser land
Tastes of that bounty, and does cloth return,
Which not for want, but ornament is worn:
For the kind spring, which but salutes us here,
Inhabits there, and courts them all the year.
Ripe fruits and blossoms on the same tree live;
At once they promise what at once they give.
So sweet the air, so moderate the clime,
None sickly lives, nor dies before his time.
Heaven sure has kept this spot of earth uncurst,
To show how all things were created first."
WALLER'S SUMMER ISLANDS, Canto 1.

Pines, melons, figs, grapes, mangoes, mammees, grenadillas, bell-apples, guavas, strawberries, soursops, sugar-apples, alligator pears, sappadillos, pomegranates, cocoa-nuts, oranges, shadocks, and forbidden fruit; these, and many more, are the productions of our West India Islands. What an elegant table has nature laid for the happy inhabitants! What health might they enjoy, sua si bona norint!

The custom of flesh eating, as much as that of covering our persons with clothes,[1] appears to have arisen from the migration of man into the northern climates, and the reaction of that circumstance, conjoined with the increasing ill effects of an unnatural diet. The cultivation of the earth, especially where its productions are not, as in the southern climates, spontaneous, implies a certain degree of intellectual progress unnecessary to him who contents himself with breaking a stick from a tree, and demolishing the first poor defenceless animal he meets with. The argument of the agreeable flavor proves nothing, I apprehend, by proving too much. If taste be admitted as a test in the present question, how shall we explain the attachment of some Africans to the eating of dirt; and that with such contumacy, that in various instances no persuasion, no interference of authority, can check or impair this inveterate appetite; in indulging which the unhappy sufferers become swollen in parts of the body, emaciated in others, linger miserably, and at length, though the form were originally herculean, they perish in contempt of the *nice art*, as the poet calls it, of the physician. I fear that we cannot be impartial judges in this dispute. Our habits have taken too firm a hold on our desires to permit us to decide whether they are all right and natural. The Eskimaux delight in train oil and rotten flesh; prefer them perhaps to roast beef; and I am not disposed to contend very eagerly for the reasonableness of our choice in opposition to theirs.

I have been leaning for the last quarter of an hour on my elbow, endeavouring to recollect any other objections which I may have heard to a general vegetable diet; that either I might omit to anticipate nothing which merits a reply, or, should I not succeed in that, might furnish perhaps some additional weapon, if the book be answered, to the hostility of an antagonist. One observation more I do remember to have combated. It has been said, that "Since trees have their disorders, why should *we* hope to escape them?" The truth is, that so many trees are exotics in the latitudes where they grow, that it cannot be expected that they should be as thriving as, and in all respects similar to, those which florish in the soil and climates more adapted to them. I think it appears in general that trees, after they have reached a certain growth, perish very gradually, and that where this is not the case, they are injured by some accidental cause. I have seen abroad several orange-trees droop from having ants' nests under their roots. But even if trees should, with all possible advantages of soil and climate, be liable to such derangements of their substances as may justify the use, without a metaphor, of the term *diseases*, still it would be a little dangerous to reason strictly from vegetable to animal life, when, in reasoning on the latter alone, we are so often perplexed by facts which obstruct our conclusions. Do not some animals feed on henbane; quails and goats on hellebore; starlings and hares on hemlock? Do not dogs swallow arsenic with comparative impunity; and some kinds of fish dart in health through the sea with poison in their bowels? The yellow-bill sprat, for example, charges its intestines with no inconsiderable portion of matter to us poisonous, on the precipices of copper which stretch for miles through the unseen bosom of the deep, and yet enjoys all the vigor of which it is capable; while a single sprat, only four inches long, has been known to kill two men who divided it between them. How might I multiply these instances, if it were worth the trouble; but I shall press no longer this argument on the reader, whom I can readily imagine not much inclined to adopt the opinion, that because the elm, the beech, or even the indigenous crab apple, happen to have an excrescence on the bark, he must therefore be doomed to lingering atrophy and asthmatic suffocation; to the taint of syphilis, or the torture of the stone.

---

[1] The inhabitants of the South Sea Isles, who have not yet given in to this custom, go to the river twice a day and wash themselves from head to foot. How much more pleasing is it to contemplate this habit of cleanliness, than if we allow the imagination to glance upon the filthy consequences of personal neglect which is by much too prevalent; neglect of which many would be ashamed, were it not for the protection they insidiously derive from their covering. This reminds me of a question which a lady, eminent for her acquirements, but rather too careless of her person, put to me one day on my observing that it was doubtful whether men need drink at all. "And pray, sir, what do you conceive that water was intended for by the Creator?" The reply was obvious. "For a purpose, madam, to which I have often had to regret that it was not more industriously applied." To be serious: It is a deep disgrace on this florishing kingdom, with its annual expenditure of nearly a hundred millions sterling, that in such a city as London, having a great command of water, there should be no such thing as a public bath. What must be the apartments, and their contents, from which those dirty people daily issue whom one passes hastily, even in the open streets, to avoid being unpleasantly assailed? Were I Chancellor of the Exchequer, I assuredly would not rest until I saw these things put into a train of being on a very different footing.

Among a great variety of authorities which might be brought in support of a suspicion and ill opinion of meat and fish in every form, I will select a few, and lay them before the reader.

"And the same John had his raiment of camel's hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins: and his meat was locusts and wild honey."—St. Matthew, iii. 4.

Thus we see that the Deity frowns not on this humble fare, since the only sustenance of John the Baptist, the favored of heaven, and the forerunner of Christ, consisted of wild honey and the fruit of the locust tree.

"Maintenant pour nous nourrir, il faut répandre du sang, malgré l'horreur qu'il nous cause naturellement; et tous les rafinemens dont nous nous servons pour couvrir nos tables, sufficent à peine à nous déguiser les cadavres qu'il nous faut manger pour nous assouvir. Mais ce n'est là que la moindre partie de nos malheurs. La vie déjà raccourcie s'abrége encore par les violences qui s'introduisent dans le genre humain. L'homme qu'on voyoit dans les premiers temps épargner la vie des bêtes, s'est accoutumé à n'épargner plus la vie de ses semblables."

"Now blood must be shed for our support, in spite of the horror with which it naturally inspires us; and all the refinements that we make use of in covering our tables, are scarcely sufficient to disguise the carcases which are required to appease our appetites. But this is the smallest part of our misfortunes. Life, already curtailed, is still further abridged by the violences which prevail among the human race. Man, who in the early ages of the world was seen to spare the lives of the animals, has accustomed himself no longer to spare even the lives of his fellow-creatures."—BOSSUET, HIST. UNIV. p. 22.

"The chief diet of the natives on the coast of New South Wales being fish, it produces a disorder very similar to that we call the itch."—COOK'S GEOGRAPHY, vol. i. p. 251.

"The emaciation of the limbs of the savages of New Holland was observed by Labillardiere. They have scarcely any fruits; the cascar and the kangaroo are their only animals, and they are scarce. Therefore they live much on fish, which often fails from their emigration, so that in the interior they live on frogs, lizards, serpents, the larvæ of insects, and on caterpillars and spiders, and even upon ants."—PERON, vol. i. p. 465.

The same defect of conformation has been remarked in the savages of Terra del Fuego.

"Their shoulders," says Foster, "and their chests, are large and bony; the rest of their limbs so thin and slender, that in looking on the different parts separately, we could not persuade ourselves that they belonged to the same individuals."

COOK'S SECOND VOYAGE.

"We are now so used to a short life and to drop away after threescore or fourscore years, that when we compare our lives with those of the antediluvians, we think the wonder lies wholly on their side, why they lived so long; and so it doth, popularly speaking; but if we speak philosophically, the wonder lies rather on our side, why we live so little or so short a time. That the state and difficulty of this question may the better appear, let us consider a man in the prime and vigor of his life, at the age of twenty or twenty-four years, of a healthful constitution, and all his vitals sound; let him be nourished with good food, use due exercise, and govern himself with moderation in all other things; the question is, why this body should not continue in the same plight and in the same strength for many ages; or at least why it should decay so soon and so fast as we see it does. We do not wonder at things that happen daily, though the causes of them be never so hard to find out; we contract a certain familiarity with common events, and fancy we know as much of them as can be known, though in reality we know nothing of them but matter of fact; which the vulgar know as well as the wise or the learned. We see daily instances of the shortness of man's life, how soon his race is run, and we do not wonder at it because it is common; yet if we examine the composition of the body, it will be very hard to find any good reasons why the frame of it should decay so soon."—BURNET'S THEORY OF THE EARTH.

What the discovery of Dr. Lambe may safely pretend to is this; if for that which Burnet calls "good food," by which he intended of course a hearty meat diet, be substituted the food that is natural to man, the whole mystery will be cleared up, and the human machinery will go on much longer than it now does, because the unknown causes which the ingenious author of the "Theory of the Earth" suspected to be operating against the lives of men, will then be removed.

From the "Acetaria" of John Evelyn, a man of some eminence in his time, I will give several extracts. The work was printed in 1706, and dedicated to John Lord Somers.

"And now after all we have advanced in favor of the herbaceous diet, there still emerges a third inquiry; namely, whether the use of crude herbs and plants is so wholesome as is pretended? What opinion the prince of physicians had of them, we shall see hereafter; as also what the sacred records of older times seem to infer, before there were any flesh shambles in the world; together with the reports of such as are often conversant among many nations and people who, to this day, living on herbs and roots, arrive to an incredible age in constant health and vigor: which, whether attributable to the air and climate, custom, constitution, &c. should be inquired into."

Before I proceed to the next extract, I must lay some stress upon the last phrase, "should be inquired into," in which sentiment I entirely coincide with this author. No subject can possibly be more interesting to mankind in general than an inquiry taken with great caution and earnestness into the means of rendering life longer and healthier than it is. A commission, distinct from medical practice, ought to be established for that purpose. The triumph which Dr. Lambe has obtained in several instances, over incipient cancer, in all of which he has checked the progress of that frightful disease, entitles his opinions and his plan to the fullest and fairest investigation. If it should be asked, what it is I propose to have done? Whether I would have an act passed by king, lords, and commons, to interdict the future use of meat to all his majesty's subjects? I answer that I know how wild would be such a project. It is nothing of this sort that I have in view; but merely that those men under whose department or influence in the hospitals, infirmaries, or work-houses, it may fall, should collect together a dozen cancer patients, on whom to try the effect of this practice; respecting whom it should be ascertained by the first surgeons that they were decidedly cancer cases, advanced only in a certain degree, though giving little or no hope of recovery under the usual treatment. Upon these patients the experiment should be made, and if it should be found, as experience gives abundant reason to conclude it would, that the progress of those cancers were uniformly stopped during the first year, and in the second year the tumors completely absorbed, this important truth, going forth to the world properly authenticated, could not fail of attracting all the attention to which its magnitude entitles it. But here we must have no deceits practised upon the public to counteract the effects of the result which is anticipated; nothing in the manner of what was done when inoculation for small-pox was introduced into this country, a century ago; nothing like the infamous attempts which have been detected against the success of vaccination, the sinister machinations of those who rather than have a chop or a chicken the less at their table, would exultingly see the world deprived of any, the greatest blessing.

That it is of the first consequence to open the eyes of the public, as to the mischiefs of the present mode of living, is evident on account of the little hope there is of relief from the faculty, which will not be disputed by those who are aware that the statements are incontrovertible which are contained in the "Letter[1] from an eminent physician in Edinburgh, to Dr. Harrison, on Medical Reform," which is to be found in Appendix B, of a pamphlet published last year, entitled "An Address to the Lincolnshire Benevolent Medical Society, by Dr. Edward Harrison."

The author says of a certain abominable habit, which is arrived at its height, "The use of distilled spirits is destructive to the health, the understanding, the morals, and the industry of the people: it debases and brutifies them; and what probably some of our statesmen may think of more consequence, it makes them bad citizens and disloyal subjects, by the surliness and ferocity which are the immediate effects of drinking spirits, and by that impatience and discontent which are the necessary consequence of idleness and profligacy, disease and poverty."—"If I am rightly informed, one company of Scotch distillers sent last year to England six hundred thousand gallons of whiskey, which of course would soon be baptized by the names of gin and British brandy, but would not be the less poisonous for that."—"I need not tell you that there are very few diseases for which we have nearly certain cures: that the use of remedies of great and general efficacy, for the cure of particular diseases, is at least precarious, often unavailing, and sometimes pernicious: that many diseases, at least in the present state of our science, seem to be incurable; and that our means of relieving such diseases are very inadequate. In consequence of this imperfect state of medicine, vast numbers every year languish long, and at last die of consumption, dropsy, palsy, gout, stone, king's-evil, cancer, asthma, &c. &c. *in spite of all our faculty can do for them.* Many thousands suffer miserably from imaginary diseases, and vapors, and low spirits; which of course can neither kill them, nor be cured by us. Many thousands suffer miserably from diseases produced by their own idleness, laziness, luxury, and intemperance, who might be cured by proper regimen, if they would submit to it, which they will not do; I mean by temperance and exercise: *but they cannot be cured by any medicines that I know of.* Then, all mankind must die at last, which very few of them are inclined to do;[1] and most of them must die of diseases, not of good old age:[2] but as they grow old, they become infirm and sickly; and they expect a cure which we cannot give them for such diseases; nay, we can give them but very imperfect relief."—p. 23.

---

[1] I refer the reader with great readiness to this letter, where he will see the above subject of Medical Reform very liberally and luminously handled.

---

[1] The distance between the two states of life and death is so great, the gulph between them so immeasurable, that it is highly preposterous, and most inconsistent with all our ideas of the benevolence of the Deity, to suppose a creature framed both to suffer death, and to contemplate its approaching miseries; to bend his mind forcibly, as a great many do, upon all its regrets and its horrors. Are such as this the privileges which we proudly call the distinctions of our species? It seems, on the other hand, very much to be expected that the placid motion of the spirits, the exemption from restlessness and turbulence of mind, which would be produced by our tranquillising regimen, would go further towards reconciling mankind to death, than all that Blair, Tillotson, or even Sherlock, ever wrote on that subject.

[2] The question is, whether it is unavoidable that they should die of diseases. I would wish to take more cheerful views than those of the physician of Edinburgh, who seems to represent the greater part of us as a sort of criminals under condemnation of torture, which indeed is but too much the case as we now proceed. In respect of the unfailing efficacy

The writer, in charitably endeavouring to moderate the indignation of the faculty against the quack-doctors, and after observing that he considers their spirituous tinctures and their analeptic and antibilious pills quite as useful as those prescribed by the physicians, composed as they generally are of the same materials, is decidedly for leaving the poor consolation of confidence in these mountebanks to sufferers who are not likely to find true relief any where. He adds, "you should consider also that England is a free country, and that the freedom which every free-born Englishman chiefly values, is the freedom of doing what is foolish and wrong, and going to the devil his own way." "Quack medicines and quacks are necessaries of life to such people, who would be more indignant than the quacks themselves if quackery was abolished by law." "I heartily wish, not only for the good of mankind, but for the honor, the comfort, and the permanent interest of all men of merit in our profession, that there were no deceit in the practice of physic."—p. 27.

The doctor, who appears to be a man of candor and ability, concludes his letter with an animated sentence dictated in the spirit of despair, after remarking that while there is so much deceit in the practice of medicine, while the bulk of mankind will not believe that it is so imperfect, and eagerly wish to deceive themselves and be deceived by others on that point, the difficulties in the way of medical reform are insurmountable.

To return to the "Acetaria" of John Evelyn. After glancing at Cardan's opinion in favor of meat, he says, "But this his learned antagonist utterly denies; whole nations, flesh-devourers (such as the farthest northern) becoming heavy, dull, inactive, and much more stupid than the southern; and such as feed much on plants are more acute, subtil, and of deeper penetration: witness the Chaldæans, Assyrians, Ægyptians, &c." And he further argues from the short lives of most carnivorous animals, compared with grassfeeders, and the ruminating kind, as the hart, camel,

---

of temperance, as it is usually understood, and exercise, it has been my lot to be intimately acquainted with several individuals whose life was temperate, and who took a sufficient quantity of exercise; but they drank common water and dined moderately every day on meat and other things, without either warding off violent attacks, or arriving at a good old age.

[1] We live in an age which witnesses the triumph of empiricism; and as according to Fontenelle's remark, "Men cannot, on any subject, arrive at what is rational, until they have first, on that very subject, exhausted all imaginable folly," we may now hope to retread our steps, having an indisputable claim to do so from a full performance of the annexed condition.

and the longævous elephant, and other feeders on roots and vegetables—p. 138.

"As soon as old Parr came to change his simple homely diet[1] to that of the Court and Arundel House, he quickly sunk and dropt away: for, as we have showed, the stomach easily concocts plain and familiar food, but finds it a hard and difficult task to vanquish and overcome meats of different substances: whence we so often see temperate and abstemious persons, of a collegiate diet, very healthy; husbandmen and laborious people more robust and longer lived, than others of an uncertain extravagant diet."

"Certain it is, Almighty God ordaining herbs and fruit for the food of man, speaks not a word concerning flesh for two thousand years. And when after, by the Mosaic constitution, there were distinctions and prohibitions about the legal uncleanness of animals, plants of what kind soever were left free and indifferent for every one to choose what best he liked. And what if it was held indecent and unbecoming the excellency of man's nature, before sin entered and grew enormously wicked, that any creature should be put to death and pain for him who had such infinite store of the most delicious and nourishing fruit to delight, and the tree of life to sustain him? Doubtless there was no need of it. Infants sought the mother's nipple as soon as born; and when grown and able to feed themselves, ran naturally to fruit; and still will choose to eat it rather than flesh; and certainly might so persist to do, did not custom prevail, even against the very dictates of nature. Nor question I but that what the heathen poets recount of the happiness of the golden age, sprang from some tradition they had received of the Paradisian fare, their innocent and healthful lives in that delightful garden."—p. 146.

"And now to recapitulate what other prerogatives the hortulan provision has been celebrated for, besides its antiquity, and the health and longevity of the antediluvians, viz. that temperance, frugality, leisure, ease, and innumerable other virtues and advantages which accompany it, are no less attributable to it. Let us hear our excellent botanist, Mr. Ray: "The use of plants," says he, "is all our life long of that universal importance and concern, that we can neither live nor subsist with any decency and convenience, or be said to live indeed at all without them. Whatsoever food is necessary to sustain us, whatsoever contributes to delight and refresh us, are supplied and brought forth out of that plentiful and abundant store. And ah! how much more innocent, sweet, and healthful, is a table covered with these than with all the reeking flesh of butchered and slaughtered animals. Certainly man by nature was never made to be a carnivorous animal, nor is he armed at all for prey and rapine, with jagged and pointed teeth, and crooked claws, sharpened to rend and tear; but with gentle hands to gather fruit and vegetables, and with teeth to chew and eat them."—p. 170.

---

[1] Taylor, the water-poet, who celebrates Parr's praises, says of him, "He was of old Pythagoras' opinion."

"To this might we add that transporting consideration becoming both our veneration and admiration of the infinitely wise and glorious Author of Nature, who has given to plants such astonishing properties; such fiery heat in some to warm and cherish, such coolness in others to temper and refresh, such pinguid juice to nourish and feed the body, such quickening acids to compel the appetite, and grateful vehicles to court the obedience of the palate; such vigor to renew and support our natural strength, such ravishing flavor and perfumes to recreate and delight us: in short, such spirituous and active force to animate and revive every part and faculty to all kinds of human, and I had almost said of heavenly capacity. What shall we add more? Our gardens present us with them all; and while the shambles are covered with gore and stench, our salads escape the insults of the summer fly, and purify and warm the blood against winter rage. Nor wants there variety in more abundance than any of the former ages could show."—p. 172.

In one of Milton's Latin elegies, addressed to his friend Deodati, there are some beautiful lines so decidedly favorable to temperance, that I will here insert them with the translation.

"At qui bella refert, et adulto sub Jove cœlum,
Heroasque pios, semideosque duces,
Et nunc sancta canit, superum consulta deorum,
Nunc latrata fero regna profunda cane;
Ille quidem parce Samii pro more magistri
Vivat, et innocuos præbeat herba cibos;
Stet prope fagineo pellucida lympha catillo,
Sobriaque e puro pocula fonte bibat.
Additur huic scelerisque vacans, et casta juventus,
Et rigidi mores, et sine labe manus.
Qualis veste nitens sacra, et lustralibus undis
Surgis ad infensos augur iture deos.
Hoc ritu vixisse ferunt post rapta sagacem
Lumina Tiresian, Ogygiumque Linon,
Et lare devoto profugum Calchanta, senemque
Orpheon edomitis sola per antra feris;
Sic dapis exiguus, sic rivi potor Homerus
Dulichium vexit per freta longa virum,
Et per monstrificam Perseiæ Phæbados aulam,
Et vada fœmineis insidiosa sonis,
Perque tuas rex ime domos, ubi sanguine nigro
Dicitur umbrarum detinuisse greges.

Diis etenim sacer est vates, divumque sacerdos,
Spirat et occultum pectus, et ora Jovem."

"But he whose verse records the battle's roar,
And heroes' feats and demigods of yore,
Th' olympic senate with her bearded king,
Or howls that loud thro' Pluto's dungeons ring;
With simpler stores must spread his Samian board;
And browse, well pleas'd, the vegetable hoard;
Close at his side the beechen cup be plac'd,
His thirst by nature's limpid beverage chas'd;
And still to vice unknown, unchang'd by art,
His be the guiltless hand, the guileless heart:
Pure as with lustral stream and snowy vest,
The priests of Jove his lifted bolt arrest.
'Twas thus the sightless seer, Tiresias far'd,
And Linus thus his frugal meal prepar'd:
Such the repasts prophetic Calchas knew,
And he whose lyre the list'ning tigers drew.
On food like this th' immortal Homer fed,
Whose muse from Troy the ten years' wanderer led,
Safely thro' Circe's wizard halls convey'd,
Safely thro' seas where wily Sirens play'd;
Safely thro' death's dark waste, and dreariest hell,
Where thronging phantoms linger'd at his spell;
For shielding gods the bard, their priest, surround,
Jove swells his breast, his accents Jove resound."

The recommendation contained in these verses, of pure water and the Pythagorean fare, is so much to our point, that it is with great pleasure I quote them. In the Latin classics there are many passages which prove that living on the fruits of the earth was considered by the ancients as natural to man, and best adapted to the preservation of his health, his life, and his morals. I will recall one or two of those passages to the reader's recollection, after remarking that to reform, or abandon one's errors and become virtuous, was proverbially expressed by the words "redire ad frugem bonam."

"Equidem multos et vidi in hac civitate et audivi, non modo qui primoribus labris gustassent hoc genus vitæ et extremis digitis attigissent, sed qui totam adolescentiam voluptatibus dedissent, emergisse aliquando, et se *ad frugem bonam, ut dicitur, recepisse*, gravesque homines atque illustres fuisse." "I have indeed both known and heard of many men in this city, who, after not merely a slight taste of this kind of life, but after having dedicated their whole youth to pleasure, at length raised their heads, betook themselves to *the good and wholesome fruits of the earth, as the proverb is*, and became substantial and illustrious characters." In Horace too there is an application of the term frugi, which I believe has never been satisfactorily explained.

"Davusne? Ita, Davus, amicum
Mancipium domino, et frugi quod sit satis, hoc est,
Ut vitale putes." Sat. lib. ii. s. 7.

"What! Davus? Yes, Davus; a faithful slave to his master, and temperate enough, so that you may conclude him likely to live." That is, so that your property in his person, which is what you chiefly care about, is tolerably safe.

This word frugi, the dative of frux, is evidently *frugi deditus*,[1] inclined to subsist on the fruits of the earth, and was used to signify in the Roman language, the possession of almost every good quality which could grace our nature.

"Temperance, that virtue without pride, and fortune without envy, that gives indolence[2] of body and tranquillity of mind; the best guardian of youth and support of old age; the precept of reason as well as religion; physician of the soul as well as the body; the tutelar goddess of health and universal medicine of life; that clears the head and cleanses the blood; that eases the stomach and purges the bowels; that strengthens the nerves, enlightens the eyes, and comforts the heart: in a word, that secures and perfects digestion, and thereby avoids the fumes and winds to which we owe the cholic and the spleen: those crudities and sharp humors that feed the scurvy and the gout, and those slimy dregs out of which the gravel and stone are formed within us: diseases by which we condemn ourselves to greater torments and miseries of life than have perhaps yet been invented by anger and revenge, or inflicted by the greatest tyrants on the worst of men." SIR WILLIAM TEMPLE'S ESSAY ON THE CURE OF GOUT.

Speaking of the habitual intemperance of men in office at home, ambassadors abroad, and governors of our provinces, he says, "But the ill consequence of it is not so obvious, though perhaps as evident to men that observe, and may be equally confirmed by reasons and examples. It is that the vigor of mind decays with that of the body, and not only humor and invention, but even judgment and resolution, change and languish with ill constitution of body and of health; and by this means public business comes to suffer by private infirmities, and kingdoms or states fall into the weaknesses and distempers or decays of those persons that manage them."—*Ibid.*

---

[1] As far as I am able to search into the etymology of those Greek and Latin substantives which signify *food*, I find that most frequently they owe their derivation to the action or the effect of eating: but that when they are derived from any particular article of diet, as is the case with *σιτος σιτιον*; and in the Latin language with cibus, and probably penus, from pendeo, the reference is to vegetables only; and that on the other hand, those words which signify fish, flesh, or fowl, or have a reference to them in any way, never give rise to general terms importing *food*. It is the property of dictionaries to be so very imperfect, that we can receive from them little or no assistance in philological researches which are not of the commonest order. In examining the verb alo, to feed, the eye in passing glanced on the neighbouring word alea, a die, which I find unaccounted for in Ainsworth's dictionary in any but the idlest manner; and yet it is pretty obviously from the Greek word *αλς*, *αλος*, salt, which mineral crystallises in cubes.

[2] "Indolence" is used in the simple sense of the term, exemption from pain.

It is scarcely necessary to add, that if these remarks of Sir William Temple be just, and he was a man who seldom made erroneous ones, the usual way of living among the higher orders, is attended with the most serious and deplorable consequences. I will conclude these extracts with some passages from Gassendi's celebrated letter to Van Helmont, and from Forster on the human species.

"Itaque ego argumentabar non videri nos a natura comparatos ad animalium carnes comedendas ex conformatione dentium. Siquidem animalibus (de terrestribus loquebar) quæ ad esum carnis natura instruxit concessos esse dentes longos, turbinatos, acutos, dissitos, inæquales; cujus generis sunt leones, tigrides, lupi, canes, feles, cætera. Quæ vero natura creavit ut herbis duntaxat fructibusve vescerentur, iis adesse dentes breves, latos, obtusos, contiguos, æqua serie dispositos; cujusmodi sunt equi, boves, oves, capræ, cervi, alia. Porro autem homines sortitos esse a natura conformationem dentium non instar animalium quæ sunt prioris generis, sed instar eorum quæ posterioris: quocirca probabile esse, cum homines sint e terrestrium animalium catalogo, voluisse naturam uti in delectu ciborum sequerentur non priora illa videlicet carnivora, sed hæc posteriora quæ simplicibus terræ donis contenta pascuntur." "I was therefore contending that we do not appear to be adapted by nature to the use of a flesh diet from the conformation of the teeth. Since all animals (I speak of terrestrial ones) which nature has formed to feed on flesh, have their teeth long, conical, sharp, uneven, and with intervals between them; of which kind are lions, tigers, wolves, dogs, cats, &c. But those which are created to subsist only on herbs and fruits have their teeth short, broad, blunt, adjoining to one another, and distributed in even rows; of which sort are horses, horned cattle, sheep, goats, deer, and some others. And farther, that men have received from nature teeth, which are unlike those of the first class, and resemble those of the second; it is therefore probable, since men are land animals, that nature intended them to follow, in the selection of their food, not the carnivorous tribes, but those races of animals which are contented with the simple productions of the earth." GASSENDI OPERA, tom. vi.—p. 20.

"Deus certe naturæ Author in eo maxime declaravit immensam quandam sapientiam, quod res omnes finibus suis sic accommodaverit, ut neque frustra quidquam factum sit, neque nobis homuncio-

nibus tutius unquam argumentari in rebus physicis liceat, quam dum arguimus causam finalem." "The great Author of nature has peculiarly displayed his stupendous wisdom in the adaptation of all things to their ends, so that he should make nothing in vain, and that it should never be permitted to us weak mortals to reason with more certainty on natural subjects than while we are tracing final causes."

"Ut cætera enim omittam, probe meministi, quod attinet ad Arborem Vitæ, opposuisse me in statu illo innocentiæ felicissimo jussum fuisse hominem comedere non pisces, aut oves, sed ex fructibus quibuscunque (excepto solo scientifico), ac potissimum ex illo vitali. Quare et jam arguere possum ex primæva et labe carente naturæ nostræ institutione, destinatos fuisse dentes ad usum non carnium, sed fructuum." "To omit other points, you well recollect that when we were speaking of the Tree of Life, I observed that in that most happy state of innocence man was commanded to eat, not fish or meat, but the fruits of the earth of every sort (the Tree of Knowledge[1] alone excepted), and especially of the fruit of the Tree of Life. Wherefore I here repeat that from the primeval and spotless institution of our nature, the teeth were destined to the mastication, not of flesh, but of fruits."

"Quod spectat ad carnes, verum quidem est hominem pasci carnibus; at quam multa, quæso, agit homo quæ sunt ipsi contra vel præter naturam! Ea illi morum perversitas contagione veluti quadam jam inusta est, ut ipsius indoles in alienam prope naturam abiisse videatur. Hinc tota illa philosophiæ virtutisque cura in eo est, ut revocare hominem ad naturæ tramitem possit." "As for flesh, true indeed it is that man is sustained on flesh; but how many things, let me ask, does man do every day which are beyond or contrary to his nature! So great and so general is the perversion of manners which has taken place in him, that he appears to have put on another disposition. Hence the whole care and concern of philosophy and moral instruction seem to consist in leading man back into those paths which he has forsaken."

If it be objected that the industry is natural by which men contrive and form the knives, hatchets, and other instruments which enable them to kill and cut up the animals they devour, i may be answered that it is also by the same natural industry tha we make swords and muskets to destroy our fellow-creatures whom we never saw or exchanged a syllable with. Yet who wil calmly say that this butchery is good or rational? The power o fitting such instruments to our iniquitous purposes is indeed from nature, but the perverse use of that power is attributable alone to our physical corruption.

---

[1] Or the Tree of Tears, according to Diodorus Siculus.

I wish that these quotations may turn the reader's attention to the clear and well reasoned letter of Gassendi, with which he cannot fail to be pleased. He will there see it stated that a lamb which had been fed on flesh until it was nine months old, on board a vessel sailing among the Greek Islands, refused the pasture that was before it when it was sent on shore, and eagerly sought the hand which held out to it its accustomed food.

In "Forster's Observations on the Varieties of the Human Species," p. 189, it is remarked, that "The dogs of the South Sea Isles are of a singular race: they most resemble the common cur, but have a prodigious large head, remarkably little eyes, pricked ears, long hair, and a short bushy tail. They are chiefly fed with fruit at the Society Isles; but in the low islands and New Zealand, where they are the only domestic animals, they live upon fish. They are exceedingly stupid, and seldom or never bark, only howl now and then; have the sense of smelling in a very low degree, and are lazy beyond measure: they are kept by the natives chiefly for the sake of their flesh." "The dogs are of the same species as with those of Otaheite, having short crooked legs, long backs, and pricked ears. They are about the size of a common turnspit; exceedingly sluggish in their nature: though this perhaps may be more owing to the manner in which they are treated, than to any natural disposition in them. They are in general fed and left to herd with the hogs, and I do not recollect one instance in which a dog was made a companion in the manner we do in Europe. Indeed the custom of eating them is an inseparable bar to their admission into society; and as there are neither beasts of prey in the island, nor objects of chase, it is probable that the social qualities of the dog, its fidelity, attachment, and sagacity, will remain unknown to the natives."

It would be no difficult task to increase the number of the instances above given, were these already adduced not fully sufficient to show that animals may be made to grow up and live on what is evidently not their natural food. It is a subject of much interest, and I trust that some student of natural history will take it up and investigate the consequences of perversion of diet among all the domestic animals. By the observations of Forster we see how far the dog, fed on fish and fruits, for neither of which his organization is fitted, may be degraded in every view except that of these islanders, who proposed only to render the flavor of his flesh delicate and agreeable. But to turn from this sort of repast, which we Europeans altogether reject, and pursue our subject.

It is not my intention to present the reader with a set of bills of fare for breakfast, dinner, and supper; but I will say a word or two of the manner in which we proceed as to this particular. Our breakfast is composed of dried fruits, whether raisins, figs, or plums, with toasted bread or biscuits, and weak tea, always made of distilled[1] water, with a moderate portion of milk in it. The children, who do not seem to like the flavor of tea, use milk with water instead of it. When butter is added to the toast, it is in a very small quantity. The dinner consists of potatoes, with some other vegetables, according as they happen to be in season; macaroni, a tart, or a pudding, with as few eggs in it as possible: to this is sometimes added a dessert. Onions, especially those from Portugal, may be stewed with a little walnut pickle and some other vegetable ingredients, for which no cook will be at a loss, so as to constitute an excellent sauce for all other vegetables. As to drinking, we are scarcely inclined, on this cooling regimen, to drink at all; but when it so happens, we take distilled water, having a still expressly for this purpose in our back-kitchen.

In the invigorated state which in two or three years would ensue on a return to the law of nature, a law which we never transgress but to our cost, the appetite would measure the quantity of vegetable food proper to be taken during the day; an advantage which is lost at a well furnished table, where the flavor of the dishes is too seductive for us to recollect that the juices of the meat have been compressed for our destruction.

Let it then be granted that of all animals man is the most unhealthy. Still I would contend that this state of disease is a forced state; and it will be found by those who adopt the diet which I am recommending, that they will regularly retread their progress in diseased action. This retrograde movement will sometimes be slow, nor must we expect, even where there is still much vigor in the constitution, that it will be more rapid than has been stated. It ought to be sufficiently so to satisfy us, when there is reason to believe that the attacks subsequent to the institution of the regimen are peculiarly salutary, and that every illness, more mild than the preceding, evolves from the frame some portion of that deleterious matter which would in time bring on premature death. What the exact description of that morbid humor may be, I leave to the investigation of the chymist or the physician. One conjecture only I will venture concerning it, which is, that the fluid is originally of a viscous nature. Some superstitious persons I have heard argue that disorders are to be received as visitations from heaven, and that there is something impious in a general attempt to supersede them. This unphilosophic view of the subject, better suited to some preceding century, I wholly disclaim; for to my apprehension, it borders on profaneness. Surely it ought never to be assumed that such an exception has been made against the happiness of man, alone, by his benevolent Creator; and if we reason analogously, and consider how measured, how definitive nature is in her operations, with how much exactness she apportions the substance which forms the bones, that which forms the muscles, the hair, or the nails in the fœtus, it will not be denied that the astonishing deviation from such laws of which human diseases are an instance, must be attributed to some extraneous cause, acting powerfully in contravention of the order of nature. My creed, I confess, is in the free agency of man, who, if he would but be contented to be and to appear what he really is in the creation, rather than "cœlum vanis cogitationibus petere," *and would honestly and heartily set about producing the utmost aggregate of happiness in his power*, would assuredly succeed in effecting a great deal.

---

[1] That I may lose no opportunity of impressing the necessity of this distillation on the reader's mind, I will give an extract from Hawkesworth's Voyages, which will show that even spirits are not so mischievous, or at least not in the same way, as common water.

"Every individual had been sick (at Batavia) except the sail-maker, an old man between seventy and eighty years of age; and it is very remarkable that this old man, during our stay at the place, was constantly drunk every day."—Vol. iii. p. 319.

Of the island of Rotterdam in the South Seas:

"The people of this isle seem to be more affected with the leprosy, or some scrofulous disorder, than any I have seen elsewhere. It breaks out in the face more than any other part of the body. I have seen several whose faces were ruined by it, and their noses quite gone. In one of my excursions, happening to peep into a house where one or more of them were, one man only appeared at the door, or hole, by which I must have entered, and which he began to stop up, by drawing several parts of a cord across it. But the intolerable stench which came from his putrid face was alone sufficient to keep me out, had the entrance been ever so wide. His nose was quite gone, and his whole face in one continued ulcer; so that the very sight of him was shocking."—COOK'S SECOND VOYAGE, vol. ii. p. 20.

"Fire wood is very convenient to be got at, and easy to be shipped off; but the water is so brackish that it is not worth the trouble of carrying it on board; unless one is in great distress for want of that article, and can get no better."—*Ibid.* p. 22.

Meat and common water, or spirits, seem to occasion derangement in the stomach and liver, and an undue impetus to the brain. They disorder the skin, they check the freedom of the secretions, and inflame the whole system; the truth of which position will be acknowledged on a very short experiment of the antiphlogistic regimen. It is a melancholy fact that scarcely has a man reached his fortieth year but he begins to feel the accumulating evils of these poisonous ingesta, and already to lose in some degree that flexibility and vigor which he owed indeed to the newness of his existence, but which, had they not been sapped by these malign and baneful influences, would have attended his motions to a much later period of life. And what remedy has there hitherto been found for the devoted sufferer? In his illnesses he looks for relief to the faculty, of whom one of their own body, Doctor Akenside, has said, and truly said, "Physicians in despair of making medicine a science have agreed to convert it into a trade." Nor is this the only shrewd observer who has taken that view of their skill. Voltaire, in the first chapter of one of his pleasant stories, exhibits the profession quite as unfavorably. "Zadig était blessé plus dangereusement; un coup de flèche reçu pres de l'œil lui avait fait une plaie profonde. Semire ne demandait aux dieux que la guérison de son amant. Ses yeux étaient nuit et jour baignés de larmes: elle attendait le moment où ceux de Zadig pourraient jouir de ses regards; mais un abcès survenu à l'œil blessé fit tout craindre. On envoya jusqu' à Memphis chercher le grand médecin Hermes, qui vint avec un nombreux cortège. Il visita le malade, déclara qu'il perdrait l'œil; il prédit même le jour et l'heure où ce funeste accident devait arriver. Si c'eut été l'œil droit, dit-il, je l'aurais guéri; mais les plaies de l'œil gauche sont incurables. Toute Babylone, en plaignant la destinée de Zadig, admira la profondeur de la science d'Hermes. Deux jours après, l'abcès perça de lui-même; Zadig fut guéri parfaitement. Hermes écrivit un livre, où il lui prouva qu'il n'avait pas dû guérir." "Zadig was more dangerously hurt; an arrow which struck him near the eye had made a deep wound. Semira asked only of the gods the recovery of her lover. Her eyes were bathed in tears day and night: she looked anxiously for the moment when those of Zadig might enjoy their regards; but an abscess which formed near the wounded eye, gave great reason to dread the consequences. They sent as far as Memphis for the celebrated physician Hermes, who came attended by a numerous retinue. He visited the sick man and pronounced that he would lose his eye; he even predicted the day and the hour when this dreadful accident would take place. Had it been the right eye, said he, I could have cured it; but the wounds of the left eye are without remedy. All Babylon, in deploring the fate of Zadig, venerated the profound knowledge of Hermes. Two days after, the tumor discharged itself spontaneously, and Zadig was perfectly cured. Hermes wrote a book, in which his object was to prove that he ought not to have been cured."

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

A
LETTER

TO THE

REV. W. L. BOWLES,

IN REPLY TO HIS LETTER TO

THOMAS CAMPBELL, ESQ.

AND TO HIS TWO LETTERS TO

THE RIGHT HON. LORD BYRON;

CONTAINING

A VINDICATION OF THEIR DEFENCE OF THE POETICAL CHARACTER OF

POPE,

AND

AN INQUIRY INTO THE NATURE OF POETICAL IMAGES, AND OF THE CHARACTERISTIC QUALITIES THAT DISTINGUISH POETRY FROM ALL OTHER SPECIES OF WRITING.

By M. M'DERMOT.

> "The vulgar thus through imitation err,
> As oft the learned by being singular;
> So much they scorn the crowd, that if the throng
> By chance go right, they purposely go wrong:
> So schismatics the plain believers quit,
> And are but damn'd for having too much wit."
> POPE.

LONDON:
1822.

A

LETTER

TO THE

Rev. WILLIAM L. BOWLES.

Reverend Sir,

In still continuing to dispute the poetical pre-eminence of Pope, it would seem you are of opinion, that your "invariable principles" have made some impression on the public mind; that it begins to pause in its judgment, to doubt the orthodoxy of the poetical creed, which has continued nearly a century to fix its belief, and to suspect the correctness of that taste which had heretofore determined it to rank Pope, if not the first, at least among the first, of English poets. In forming this judgment, however, I suspect you have listened more to the suggestions of self-adulation, and the ambition of founding a new poetic creed, than to the sober conclusions of reason and philosophy; for I trust, that neither the revolutions of empire, nor the vicissitudes of literature, will ever lead men to believe, that the subject of a poem constitutes more of its poetical excellency, than it derives from the creative genius of the poet himself. Believing, however, that moral as well as physical diseases, are more easily eradicated in their growth, than after they have assimilated with the natural habits and constitution, you will not feel displeased, that I should address you as the author of a theory, which, if once established, would not only vitiate the purity of public taste, but send down to posterity, with diminished lustre, the character of a poet, whose name should be as immortal as his poetic genius was pre-eminent.

If I prove your theory to be erroneous, you will feel indebted to me for undeceiving you, and you will remove from the ranks of those who

> "———Drily plain, without invention's aid,
> Write dull receipts how poems may be made."

Lord Byron, Mr. Campbell, and the writer who reviewed your principles in the Quarterly Review, feel no hesitation in placing Pope by the side of Shakspeare and Milton. In granting him this honorable distinction, they only expressed a feeling which has long since communicated itself to all ranks. The common feeling of mankind is the true standard of taste; but if the *vox populi* be the *vox Dei* in any species of literature, it is particularly so in poetry, the creations and associations of which, are addressed to the feelings and imagination alone. In judging of the poetical character, it is he only who can feel, that is qualified to decide; and as Nature, in the distribution of her gifts to man, has more largely endowed him with the susceptibilities of feeling, than with the discriminations of intellect, the generality of mankind are better qualified to judge of an art, whose influence is confined to the heart and its affections, than of theories that address themselves to the understanding alone. All men are not qualified to determine, whether a proposition be true or false; but all men must know how they feel affected by the sentiments and images of poetry; and as the merits of a poet entirely consist in exciting the feelings which he intended to excite, every man can tell, whether he feel them himself or not; and if the generality of mankind agree in their feelings, the pre-eminence of the poet is not only established, but demonstrated.

You, Sir, however, who are a host in yourself, and capable, if not of confuting, at least of disputing with all the admirers of Pope, refuse him the honorable station which has been assigned him by the suffrages of the public, and insist that he must descend from his throne, to rank with an inferior order of poets. You have not favored us with the names of the poets whom you think fit companions for Pope; but you have sufficiently enabled us to collect from the spirit of your strictures, that he must rank with no *natural* poet. Do not suspect that I use the word *natural*, in the gross and vulgar meaning which Pope would attach to it: I use it in that refined and privileged sense which it conveys in the purer diction of Mr. Bowles. By ranking with no natural poet, I mean to say, that Pope must rank with no poet who talks about nature, who takes his images from nature—whose subject is nature—who affects to admire only what is sublime in nature, and to look down with indifference from the sublime pinnacle of his own mightiness on all the productions of art, because, forsooth, they are the works of his own hands. Such a poet is entitled to immortality, if your theory be entitled to credit; and, no doubt, you would become as immortal yourself as Homer or Virgil, had you not come into the world so many ages after them. With regard to future immortality, however, your fame must necessarily be co-existent with theirs; for as you were acquainted, in all probability, with this golden theory of nature, before you "began to serve your apprenticeship to the Muses," you must have studiously avoided all terms of art in your poetical works; and as a poem, according to your inestimable theory, which so admirably dispenses with all the finer associations and creations of genius, derives "its poetical beauty from nature," and from nature alone, it is obvious, that the "poetical beauty" of your works must far exceed that of Homer or Virgil. Your poems are all nature; theirs are frequently polluted with terms of art. You have therefore frequently thrust nature in, where they would have thrust her out. As your poetry is then more natural, and more richly decorated with natural images, which, you say, "are more beautiful and sublime than any images drawn from art; and therefore, *per se*, more poetical," it follows very clearly, that your pre-eminence as a poet, will far outshine that of Homer or Virgil, and that you must be henceforth looked upon as the prince of poets. It matters little that their genius, invention, execution, and mental energies should be superior to yours; for your theory packs genius, invention, and execution out of doors at once, when you tell us that "*a description of a forest is more poetical than a description of a cultivated garden*, WHATEVER MIGHT BE THE DIFFERENCE OF MERIT IN POINT OF EXECUTION." Now, Sir, as your poems are all forests, that is, all images and subjects taken from nature; and as such subjects and images are more poetical, "whatever might be the difference of merit in point of execution," it is as clear as demonstration itself, that your works must be more poetical than those of Homer or Virgil, and consequently, that you are a greater poet than either. In saying that all your subjects and images are taken from nature, I merely suppose so from your own theory; for who would choose any other subjects or images, who was acquainted with the value of them, and the immortality which they are calculated to confer upon the lowest and the most sluggish of the Dunciad tribe?

It matters little, according to your "invariable principles," how ignorant a poet may be of nature itself, provided he talk of nothing else,—how ignorant he may be of the soul and spirit of poetry, or of the propriety of the images which he introduces into it, provided they are taken from nature alone, and excite no associations connected with art, or its productions. I am aware that this will appear to some of your readers, not to be ostensibly your theory; for it is so enveloped in sophistry of diction, and confusion of terms, that it is calculated to deceive some, and to confound others in labyrinths of inexplicable and indefinite meaning. I am, however, prepared to prove, that this is virtually your theory; and I am equally prepared to prove, that your theory would make "Thomson's Seasons" infinitely more beautiful and poetical than the "Iliad," or "Paradise Lost."

I regret, indeed, that I should have to take up the subject after Lord Byron, whose reply to you is the reply of a philosopher, a poet, and a writer of refined and classical taste, and which you acknowledge yourself to be "at once argumentative and eloquent." But neither refined taste, nor philosophy, using the term in its enlarged acceptation, I mean that philosophy which looks only to the grander and sublimer operations of nature, without descending to that metaphysical abstraction, that watches and detects the minuter elements of which she is composed, can enable us to silence a writer whose baseless theories are profoundly immerged in what I have already called "labyrinths of inexplicable and indefinite meaning." It seems to have escaped Lord Byron, that the fallacy of your theory lay in your words, and therefore he replied to you as a poet and a philosopher, rather than as a metaphysician. In this, I think his Lordship has erred, for it is only as a metaphysician that he could enter the labyrinths, and explore the secret holds, in which you had secured, or hoped to secure, your doubtful retreat—in a word, that he could prove, either that your propositions conveyed no meaning, or that if they conveyed any, it was a meaning, founded in error, supported by sophistry, and clothed in the light drapery of sensible though unsubstantial reality. Lord Byron probably had not patience to pursue you through all the involutions and oppositions of sense that characterize your "invariable principles," and the variable arguments by which you endeavor to maintain them: probably the sublime conceptions and rapid energies that characterize his writings, would not suffer him to linger over privations of thought, or to seek for gleams of understanding amid wastes of intellect. If, therefore, I succeed in demonstrating the fallacy of your "invariable principles," perhaps I should attribute my success to the want of genius, rather than to the possession of it.

Lord Byron says, that, in poetry, the subject is nothing, the execution is every thing. This position his lordship has satisfactorily proved; though, from not attacking the evil at the root, and proving that neither images, taken from art or nature, are poetical *per se*, he has left you an opportunity of replying to him again;

and you will always reply, till this fallacy on which your whole theory rests, is, to borrow an expression from yourself, "blown away to the winds." While, therefore, I agree with his Lordship in all the arguments which he has advanced against your invariable principles, I differ with him only in granting images or objects to be poetical *per se;* and I doubt not but he will acknowledge the validity of the reasons that have led me to do so. With your principles and illustrations I disagree in *toto;* and if I succeed in proving that there is no object, either in art or nature, "*poetical per se*," your principles necessarily are only the "airy nothings" of your own creation, to which, if I mistake not, you will never be able to give "a local habitation and a name."

Your principles are contained in the following extract from the tenth volume of your edition of Pope's Works:—

"I presume it will readily be granted, that all images drawn from what is beautiful or sublime in the works of nature, are more beautiful and sublime than any images drawn from art, and that they are therefore, *per se*, more poetical."

"In like manner, those passions of the human heart which belong to nature in general, are, *per se*, more adapted to the higher species of poetry, than those which are derived from incidental and transient manners. A description of a forest is more *poetical* than a description of a cultivated garden, and the passions which are pourtrayed in the epistle of an Eloisa, render such a poem more poetical (whatever might be the difference of merit in point of execution), intrinsically more poetical, than a poem founded on the characters, incidents, and modes of artificial life; for instance, the 'Rape of the Lock.'"

"If this be admitted, the rule by which we would estimate Pope's general poetical character would be obvious."

Here we have the sum and substance of your principles. What follows is a mere elucidation of them; and as your propositions are laid down dogmatically, and without any qualification whatever, they must stand or fall by themselves. If they be erroneous, they cannot be explained away by any logical evasions, nor redeemed by that torture of argument to which writers, engaged in a hopeless cause, have so frequently recourse.

Your first principle is, that "images drawn from what is beautiful or sublime in the works of *nature*, are more beautiful and sublime than any images drawn from *art*, and that they are, therefore, *per se*, more *poetical*." In this proposition you evidently confound the terms beautiful and sublime with poetical; for, to say that an object is poetical in proportion as it is sublime and beautiful, is to say, that sublime, beautiful, and poetical, are synonymous terms—a fallacy the more necessary to be detected, as it has given the arguments which you have used in your reply to Lord Byron, a degree of plausibility, which vanishes into air, the moment we perceive the sophistry on which it rests. If every thing that is beautiful and sublime be also poetical, it follows, that the Deity is the most poetical of all beings, because he is the most sublime; and yet, if any person spoke to you of a *poetical* deity, I doubt whether you would imagine for a moment, that he alluded to the sublime Creator of heaven and earth. That a sublime object may be a proper subject for poetical description I do not deny, while I maintain that other objects are equally so; but that a sublime object is a poetical one, I believe no person will admit. Beautiful and poetical objects are equally distinct from each other. The fair sex are generally allowed to afford us the best specimens of beauty; but who would think of calling his wife the most poetical woman in England, if she happened to be the most beautiful? I doubt whether she would even be the best subject for poetical description; and though I admit, that the most beautiful of women will always be acknowledged by mankind as the most beautiful of all sensible objects, yet there will still be many objects in nature, infinitely better calculated for poetic description than the mere personal form or beauty of the most beautiful woman. Were I even to confine myself to woman alone, I think few will deny, that her virtues, her sensibilities, and the union of her mental attractions and sympathetic affections, yield more rapture and enthusiasm to the associations of the poet, and are consequently capable of being rendered more poetical, than the most exquisite delineations of mere external form. In saying, therefore, that whatever is beautiful and sublime must be poetical, you have attached a latitude of meaning to the term, which neither the English nor any other language will admit. Those writers who have most profoundly investigated the origin of our ideas of the sublime and beautiful, never imagined they were only writing treatises on the poetical; and yet it is certain, that if every thing sublime and beautiful be poetical, all the works written on these subjects since the time of Longinus, are so many treatises on poetry. You had, no doubt, your own reasons for not explaining to your readers the fixed and definite idea which you attached to the term poetical; and had you even been willing to do so, it is still a question whether you were acquainted with it; or whether you attached any certain idea, or association of ideas, to the term at all. Nothing can be more favorable to the aims of a controversial writer than the latitude of meaning that is attached to some terms; but there is a certain boundary, beyond which no correct, or even sensible writer, will extend the terms which he makes use of. It is, moreover, a duty in every writer, who rests an argument on any term, to explain in what sense he uses it at the time.

It appears, therefore, either that you attached no fixed meaning to the term poetical, or that you purposely used it in a vague and undefined sense, in order that the ambiguity of your terms might gain credence to the fallacy of your arguments. It will, however, soon appear, if you submit to the conclusions that obviously result from your own arguments and principles, that you have entirely mistaken the true nature of poetry; and that, consequently, the distich which you have so frequently applied to Lord Byron, is more applicable to yourself:

> "It grieves me much, the clerk might say again,
> Who writes so well should ever write in vain."

I will readily grant, that there is considerable difficulty in distinguishing poetical, beautiful, and sublime images from each other; or, if it should be easy to determine whether a certain image be beautiful, poetical, or sublime, it would still be found difficult to tell, what universally distinguished all objects and images to which these terms are applicable. But, though all writers have felt, and many eminent writers have endeavoured to remove, this difficulty, you, I believe, are the only writer who have confounded them with each other. You go still farther, and tell us, that whatever is picturesque is also poetical, in which case it must be sublime and beautiful also. In truth, the poetical becomes whatever you choose to make of it; so that no one can be surprised at the little embarrassment with which you seem to defend your theory, who perceives the latitude of meaning, if it may not be called total want of meaning, which you attach to the words on which your arguments principally depend.

But perhaps you will reply, that you do not use the terms poetical, beautiful, sublime, and picturesque, as synonymous; and contend, that though every thing beautiful, sublime, and picturesque, is poetical, it does not follow, that every thing poetical must be sublime. That you will make use of this argument, I am inclined to think from the following notice, prefixed to your Reply to Lord Byron: "It would be important for the reader to keep in mind, one plain distinction in reading what is here offered. Whatever is picturesque is so far poetical; but all that is poetical does not require to be picturesque." By a parity of reasoning you will reply, that whatever is sublime and beautiful is so far poetical; though whatever is poetical does not require to be sublime and beautiful. Now, Sir, if this argument be just, it follows, that the poetical is a genus, of which the sublime, the beautiful, &c.

are species. You cannot consider them as different qualities of it, for if the sublime were a mere quality of the poetical, the sublime itself could not be poetical, inasmuch as nothing can be poetical that wants any of the qualities that essentially constitute its proper nature and distinctive character, in whatever this proper character consists. But as the sublime, in this case, would be only one of the qualities that constitute the poetical, it could not be poetical itself, as it would not contain the other qualities that belong to it, as the beautiful, the picturesque, &c. The lion is distinguished from other animals by his large head, shaggy and pendent mane, strength of limb, formidable countenance, horrible roar, &c. If an animal possessed one of these qualities, such as a large head, he would not be a lion; nor even if he resembled the lion in his nature, instinct, and all the qualities by which he is distinguished, but wanted his large head, or any individual quality that essentially belongs to him, he would not be a lion, though he might belong to the tribe of which he is a species. If then the sublime, the beautiful, and the picturesque, be different qualities of the poetical, neither of them can be poetical in itself, as neither of them embraces all or any of the other qualities that belong to it; for a mental as well as a material object, is made up, not of one but of the whole aggregate of qualities that suggested its idea to the mind.

It is therefore evident, that if the beautiful, the sublime, and the picturesque, be poetical, they must be so many different species, of which poetical is a genus. Now, if a sublime, a beautiful, and a picturesque object, be each of them a species of the poetical, each of them must possess in itself all the qualities that constitute the poetical; as a man, a horse, and a deer, contain each of them in itself, every quality that enters into our idea of the generic term, animal. It therefore follows, that wherever we meet a sublime object or image in writing, it must be poetical, because it contains its poetical nature in itself. And this you subsequently admit, when you tell us, that objects are poetical in themselves, *per se*, and without any regard to the manner in which they are described. "The sun," you say, "would be poetical if it shone upon none of the emmets of earth, man, or his little works, *per se*, abstractedly." You likewise affirm, that, "the ocean wants not the accessaries of any thing human to make it sublime, and therefore poetical." Wherever the sun or the ocean occurs in description, they must be therefore poetical, because their poetical nature is not contingent, not depending on the nature of the description, nor on any thing human. Now, it is easy to make an experiment, and try whether images sublime in themselves, will be poetical wherever they are met in description. To this mode of putting your theory to the test, you cannot reasonably object, as you have yourself set the example; and if you even had not, you could not object to it. As you have particularly pitched on the sun and the ocean, as two of the objects that are always poetical, "*per se*, abstractedly, and without the accessaries of any thing human," I have introduced them both into the two following lines, which I hardly think you will call poetical:

The *sun* had risen before we left town,
And we got within sight of the *ocean* about five o'clock.

Now, Sir, if these two lines be not poetical, it is certain, that we may meet with your Sun and Ocean, and all your abstract poetical images, in a thousand narratives and descriptions, that have not a particle of poetry in them: and if not, to what purpose are they called poetical? Perhaps you will reply, that though these lines are not entirely poetical, yet that that part of them is poetical which is occupied by the sun and ocean. If so, the two following lines must be extremely poetical, judging of poetical lines by the portion of them devoted to poetical words,

The *sun*, *stars*, *planets*, and *firmament*,
Give light to the *ocean* and the *earth*.

If these two lines be not poetical, I fear your sublime poetical images, those images that are "poetical, without the accessaries of any thing human," are worth but little; for I cannot understand a person who tells me, that certain terms are poetical in themselves, and yet acknowledges, that two lines are not poetical in which several of them are collected together. You cannot reply, that they would be poetical if they were associated in a poetical *manner;* because this would be to admit, that their poetry depended upon the manner in which they were introduced, not on themselves, which is the very theory Lord Byron supports, and to which yours stands directly opposed. If you and I were to write a poem on the same subject, and agreed to introduce only the same images, the public, no doubt, would call yours a beautiful poem, and mine something that

Learn'd to crawl upon poetic feet.

Whence, then, would the difference arise? Not certainly from the difference of our subjects, or images; for they would be the same. I doubt, then, whether human ingenuity can point out any cause for your production being poetry and poetical, and mine being prosing, prosaic verse, except the difference of our *manner* or *execution;* and, consequently, the entire of poetry must depend on this manner or execution. That none of it depends upon the subject is manifest from my composition not being in the least degree poetical; which could not possibly be the case, if the subject or images were in the least poetical *per se*, abstractedly, and without the accessaries of any thing human.

If you should take a new ground, and say, that by poetical images, and a poetical subject, you mean images and subjects calculated for poetry, my argument still reduces you to the same dilemma as in the former case; for it proves, that whatever the subject or images may be, or however well calculated for poetry, the description of them will have no poetry whatever, but what it derives from the manner or execution of the poet. Whenever a description, therefore, is poetical, it derives, in all cases whatever, this character from the genius of the poet; which genius you may call manner, execution, treatment, handling, invention, genius, or by whatever other term you please. If the subject were poetical in itself, it would continue to retain this character in the most unpoetical hands. As, then, in all cases where an object or image is poetical in description, it is rendered so entirely by the *manner* in which it is introduced, nothing surely can be more romantic than to attribute its being poetical to any other cause than that by which it is effected.

Again, Sir, if picturesque description be a species of poetry, the following extract from a most picturesque fragment, is poetical in the highest degree:

"Sir Bertrand turned his steed towards the wolds, hoping to cross these dreary moors before the curfew. Night overtook him. It was one of those nights when the moon gives a faint glimmering of light through the thick black clouds of a lowering sky. Now and then she suddenly emerged in full splendor from her veil, and then instantly retired behind it, having just served to give the forlorn Sir Bertrand a wide extended prospect over the desolate waste. ......He had not long continued in that posture when the sullen toll of a distant bell struck his ears. He started up, and, turning towards the sound, discerned a dim, twinkling light—and by a momentary glimpse of moon-light he had full view of a large, antique mansion, with turrets at the corners, and an ample porch in the centre. The injuries of time were strongly marked on every thing about it. The roof in various places was fallen in, the battlements were half demolished, and the windows broken and dismantled. A drawbridge, with a ruinous gateway at each end, led to the court before the building. He entered, and instantly the light, which proceeded from a window in one of the turrets, glided along and vanished. The moon sunk beneath a black cloud, and the night was darker than ever. All was silent.—At the same instant, a deep sullen toll sounded from the turret. He lifted up the latch of the gate—the heavy door creaking upon its hinges, reluctantly yielded to his hand. ...... He beheld across a hall, upon a large staircase, a pale bluish flame, which cast a dismal gleam of light around. He advanced towards it—it retired—he followed in silent horror, treading lightly, for the echoes of his footsteps startled him!"

This is exceedingly picturesque, but is it exceedingly poetical, or can it properly be called a fragment of a poem? If so, we have many poems in the English language which were never recognised as such;—whose authors never knew themselves to be poets;—and who have never been acknowledged such by the world.

It is not, however, in the least necessary to prove, that the sublime, the beautiful, and the picturesque, differ from the poetical, in order to prove the mistaken view of poetry on which your principles are founded, and the fallacy of attributing the "poetical excellency" of a poem to the subject, and not to the art and powers of the poet. I will then grant, for a moment, that whatever is sublime is also poetical; and I still maintain, that whatever is poetical in a poem, must depend on the art and powers of the poet.

I must then distinguish two sorts of sublime—the sublime *in* nature, and the sublime in description. These you have confounded with each other, as you have all your other terms; and no doubt this confusion of terms has served, in no small degree, to confound yourself, though it may have astonished your admirers. The *naturals* in this country, as well as in France, admire in proportion as they do not understand: they adore idealisms, because, in their opinion, they require neither common sense nor reason; and as nature is the most inexplicable of all things, they enlist under her banners, and affect to be her disciples, while they are, in reality, her most perverse and obstinate enemies. I distinguish, then, the sublime in nature from the sublime in description, and say, that your arguments can have reference only to the latter, though you generally rest them on the former. The sun and ocean may be as poetical as you please to make them in nature; but this poetry belongs as little to you, to Pope, or to any other poet whatever, as it does to all mankind. If the sun be poetical, this proves neither you nor him a good or bad poet: the sun has not covenanted to impart any portion of its poetry to either of you; and therefore if Bavius introduced the sun into a description, it would be as poetical as if it were introduced by Homer, so far as regards the poetry which it possesses in nature. If it carries its poetical nature with it into description, it must do so always, by whomsoever the description is written; and so far as the abstract poetical nature of the sun is poetical in description, it is equally so in all descriptions. If, then, the sun be more poetical in one description than another, the difference must arise from the manner in which it is introduced, and therefore the superiority of the one poet over the other arises from his manner, genius, &c. and not from the sun or the introduction of it into his poem. Now, supposing you were to introduce the sun into a poem, and Mr. Campbell to introduce a ship, is it not obvious, that in comparing your respective merits as poets, and in determining which of you should rank highest in the poetical world, we must not look for a moment to the image which either of you have introduced, because if the sun were, *per se*, more poetical than the ship, yet this part of its poetry is no concern of yours? You derive no "poetical pre-eminence" from it; for it would be as poetical in the productions of the veriest scribbler, nay in the language of the idiot who happens to talk of the sun, as it would be in yours. If then you render it more poetical in description than a common scribbler, the difference will arise from your manner, and therefore your merits must be estimated by your manner alone, as it is it alone that has enabled you to render your description more poetical than his. If, accordingly, the mere introduction of the sun confers no "poetical pre-eminence," no eminence of any kind upon you, but what it would confer upon an idiot, and if it be manner alone that determines poetical pre-eminence, it is obvious that, in comparing your poetical merits with those of Mr. Campbell, it is only your mode of handling or treating your subject and images, that is to be taken into consideration. If therefore his manner, style, execution, invention, &c. be happier and more poetic than yours, it will be in vain for you to cry out, "my description is filled with all the sublime poetical images in heaven and earth." The world will look to your manner of introducing these images, and the world, consequently, will determine your poetical merits by your manner alone.

The poet, therefore, can derive no "poetical pre-eminence" for introducing images that are sublime in nature, because their poetry or sublimity do not belong to him, and therefore, if he can claim any "poetical pre-eminence," it must be for images that are sublime in description. But what renders an image sublime in description? If you reflect for a moment, you will perceive, that it is the manner of the describer, and not the original sublimity of the object, whose image is pourtrayed. The sublimest object in creation will become ridiculous in the hands of an unskilful artist; that is, his description will not be sublime, though the object he describes is sublime in nature. The subject of the following description by Blackmore is exceedingly sublime; but the description itself is ridiculous, and affords so good an example of the "Art of Sinking," that Dr. Arbuthnot has quoted it in his treatise on that art:

> Ætna, and all the burning mountains find
> Their kindled stores with inbred storms of wind
> Blown up to rage, and roaring out complain,
> As torn with inward gripes and torturing pain,
> Laboring they cast their dreadful vomit round,
> And with their melted bowels spread the ground.

You perceive then, Sir, that the sublime in description does not depend upon the sublimity of the object described, but derives its entire sublimity from the manner, or, as you express it, the "execution" of the person who describes. You will no doubt reply, that though a subject sublime in nature, may be rendered ridiculous in description, yet unless it be sublime in nature, the genius of the poet cannot render it sublime in description. I have no doubt but the greater part of the poets, who belong to the *natural school* of poetry, would fail in making it so; believing, as they do, that it would be unnatural to attempt rendering an object sublime in description, which is not so in nature. But I cannot help saying, with Lord Byron, "Away with this cant about nature and invariable principles of poetry. A great artist will make a block of stone as sublime as a mountain; and a good poet will imbue a pack of cards with more poetry than inhabits the forests of America." If, however, you require proofs for this assertion, I feel happy in giving you one from Virgil and another from Homer, for which I acknowledge myself indebted to Mr. Payne Knight. "There are many things," he says, "sublime in description which are not so in reality, as there are objects beautiful in painting, which are not so in nature. No person, I believe, ever felt any sublime emotions on viewing a swarm of bees wrangling in the air; but Virgil's description of it, though strictly true, is sublime in the extreme:—

> Ergo, ubi ver nactæ sudum, camposque patentes,
> Erumpunt portis; concurritur; æthere in alto
> Fit sonitus, magnum mixtæ glomerantur in orbem,
> Præcipitesque cadunt. Non densior aëre grando,
> Nec de concussa tantum pluit ilice glandis.
> Ipsi per medias acies, insignibus alis,
> Ingentes animos angusto in pectore versant,
> Usque adeo obnixi non cedere, dum gravis aut hos,
> Aut hos, versa fuga victor dare terga coegit.[1]

"Most of the similes in Homer taken from minute objects are sublime. There are few persons who have not seen crowds of water-fowl fluttering about a moor without feeling any sublime emotions from them: but in the poet's numbers, no imagery was ever more grand, though without one circumstance of exaggeration, or one metaphor of embellishment:—

---

[1] Georgic iv. 77.

> *Των δ', ὥστ' ορνιθων πετεηνων εθνεα πολλα,*
> *Χηνων, η γερανων, η κυκνων δουλιχοδειρων,*
> *Ασιῳ εν λειμωνι, Καϋστριου αμφι ῥεεθρα,*
> *Ενθα και ενθα ποτωνται αγαλλομεναι πτερυγεσσι,*
> *Κλαγγηδον προκαθιζοντων, σμαραγει δε τε λειμων."*[1]

Does it require farther proof, Sir, to demonstrate that the sublime in description depends entirely on the genius of the poet; that without this genius the most sublime object in nature will become ridiculous in description; that with this genius, the most indifferent object will become sublime? If, then, the sublime in description depends entirely on the genius of the poet, and not on the subject, and if he can derive no portion of his poetic excellency from the sublime in nature, as I have already proved, it follows that all sublimity connected with poetical excellency, depends wholly, and without exception, on the genius of the poet; and, consequently, if you could succeed in proving, that whatever is most sublime is also most poetical, yet as this very sublimity itself must be traced to the genius of the poet alone, as the most sublime object in nature will be ridiculous without this genius, and the most indifferent sublime, when clothed in the magic vesture of its enchantment, it is demonstratively evident, that all "poetical excellency," and all "poetical pre-eminence," must be ascribed to the genius, or, if you prefer, to the execution of the poet alone.

The passages which I have quoted from Virgil and Homer show how unnecessarily you request of Lord Byron "to remember" that you "speak not of nature generally, but of images sublime or beautiful in nature." With regard to "images sublime in nature," I have already proved, that they cannot be a source of "poetical excellency," that this excellency must be derived from the sublime in description alone. Your anxiety then to impress on Lord Byron's mind, that you "speak not of nature generally, but of images sublime and beautiful in nature," is perfectly unavailing, as the above passages prove, that "nature generally," which you think proper to discard from "poetical excellency," may be rendered sublime and poetical in description, by the creative pencil of genius; whereas, the most sublime objects in nature will be ridiculous in description, where this genius is absent. And yet you tell his lordship, that if he "had only kept this circumstance in recollection, his 'hog in the high wind, footman's livery,' &c. would go for nothing; for natural as these images might be, they are neither sublime nor beautiful." It is your argument, however, that goes for nothing; for though these objects are neither sublime nor beautiful in nature, they could be rendered so in description; and it is only this latter sublimity that has any relation to poetic excellency, as I have already shown. You perceive then how you have confounded yourself, by confounding the sublime in nature with the sublime in description. Were I to say, that the liberty you take with language is unpardonable, you could hardly think me severe. You almost invariably call objects in nature by the name of images, by which you confound the copy with the original. You say that you "speak not of images sublime or beautiful in nature." I never saw, and I am inclined to think, that you never did see, a sublime or beautiful image in nature. Nature, indeed, presents us with many sublime objects; but she transfers to Art the exclusive right of presenting us with the images of these objects. Who then can enter the fierce arena of controversy with you, when you are thus armed at all points, oblige your opponent to understand all your terms, in whatever sense you please to annex to them, and confound the shadow for the substance, the appearance for the reality, and *vice versa*, as often as you think proper? You tell us that a "hog in a high wind, ;a footman's livery, Paddington Canal," &c., are natural but not sublime *images*. I doubt whether they are one or the other, because I doubt whether you can point out the prototypes in nature of which they are images.

---

[1] Iliad, B. 459.

Having shown, that if you could even succeed in proving the sublime to be always poetical, yet all "poetical excellency and poetical pre-eminence" must, even in this case, result from the "art and powers of the poet," I proceed to show, that the sublime and beautiful are qualities in objects, and consequently in description, perfectly distinct from the poetical, though an object and a description may be sublime and poetical, as a woman may be virtuous and beautiful at the same time. In all cases, however, the sublimity of a description is as easily distinguished from its poetry, as the beauty of a woman from her virtue.

I assert, then, *in limine*, that there is not a poetical object to be found within the whole compass of the works of nature or of art. An object, or image, may be sublime or beautiful, but neither sublimity nor beauty can render an object poetical *per se*. A beautiful object, for instance, whether it be the work of nature or of art, derives its beauty from the whole aggregate and disposition of parts and qualities which it possesses. Make the lips of the Venus de Medicis thinner or thicker, the nose shorter or longer, the attitude more or less erect, more or less majestic, and you lessen the beauty in a very sensible degree. But to render an object poetical, you must endow it with qualities that do not, or conceal some of those that properly do, belong to it. To describe all the external qualities or appearances of an object belongs to the antiquarian, the historian, the connoisseur, and the mere describer of external nature: to describe its internal structure, component parts, and recondite qualities or properties, belongs to the chemist, the anatomist, and the natural philosopher; but these descriptions will never be-poetical. A sculptor, or experienced connoisseur, would give a more faithful and correct description of the Venus de Medicis than a poet would ever think of giving; and in reading such a description we perceive the object described must be extremely beautiful. But who would ever think of calling such a description poetical? Yet no description could be more poetical, if we adopt your theory; for as an object, according to you, must be poetical, in proportion as it is beautiful; or, what is equivalent, as a more beautiful must be more poetical than a less beautiful object, it follows, that a faithful and accurate description of the Venus de Medicis would be more poetical, because its beauty would be more clearly perceived than the most poetical description of a less beautiful object. An accurate description of the Venus de Medicis must surely place the beauty of the statue in the fullest light; and, therefore, according to your theory, it would be the most poetical, because it would best preserve its real, original, poetical nature. Yet experience, and the common consent of mankind, teach us, that such a description, so far from being rendered more poetical by its extreme correctness, and by giving us a perfect idea of this beautiful statue, would have no pretensions to poetry at all, while the description of a toad or a viper might be rendered eminently poetical by the magic associations of genius. This doctrine perfectly accords with Mr. Campbell's idea of poetry. "Delightful," he says, "as nature is to us, yet a literal and fac-simile transcript of her accidental appearances will not constitute poetry." As it is probable, however, that you will object to Mr. Campbell's authority, I give the following description of the Sibyl's Temple at Tivoli, than which, according to Mr. Uvedale Price, "no building is more universally admired for its beauty." The description I give is from the pen of Mr. Knight, and will be found extremely minute and accurate:—

"The ruins of the Temple of Vesta, vulgarly called the Sibyl's Temple, at Tivoli, has been unquestionably admired for its beauty. Compared with the Pantheon, or the Parthenon, it was certainly small; but compared with any edifice of similar plan (the proper object of comparison) it was by no means so; for, though smaller in diameter than that of the same goddess at Rome, it appears to have been, altogether, a larger, more massive, and more considerable building, than either that or any other of the kind known.

"It is all over rough with sculpture, and built of the most rugged, porous, unequal stone ever employed in a highly wrought edifice."

"The parts, instead of having any variety, or even difference in their direction, all converge to one centrical point, as they necessarily must in a building completely circular. Even the columns have a horizontal inclination inwards equal to their perpendicular diminution upwards, which shows a most scrupulous attention to exclude every appearance of such variety.

"Every thing is composed of angles: the entablature consists of angles projecting beyond each other; the suffit, of angles indented within each other; the capitals are clusters of angles, obtuse in the abacus, and acute in the foliage, while the columns being fluted exhibit circles of angles round every shaft, and stand upon a basement surrounded by a cornice composed chiefly of angular mouldings."

I feel it is unnecessary to pursue this description farther, because I know you will not hesitate to acknowledge that it has nothing of poetry in it, beautiful as the object is which it describes, and accurate as the picture is which it presents of it. Now, Sir, if a more beautiful be a more poetical than a less beautiful object, whence does it happen that this description of a beautiful object is not poetical? You will not surely contend that it arises from the inaccuracy of the description, and from its not faithfully delineating the beauty of the original. Does it arise, then, from its not being restricted to measure, numbers, quantity, and rhyme? If so, measure, numbers, quantity, and rhyme, are essential to poetry, and consequently, an object or image may be beautiful without being poetical, because it may be beautiful without measure, number, quantity, or rhyme. I believe, however, you will not hesitate to acknowledge, that if this prose description of Mr. Knight were turned into rhyme, it would still be prosaic, though the accuracy and correctness of the expression should be faithfully preserved. It is obvious, then, that the mere beauty of the object described, is not sufficient to render either itself, or the description of it, poetical, not even when this description is subjected to the poetic restrictions of measure, number, quantity, and rhyme. The object may be beautiful, the description a *fac-simile* of the original, the numbers, measure, quantity, and rhyme, regulated by the strictest laws of poetic harmony and versification, and yet there may be no poetry in the description. There must, then, be something beyond mere beauty, number, measure, quantity, and rhyme, to render a description poetical. Of this something, Sir, you appear to be ignorant, and while you are so, you cannot tell in what poetry consists; and if not, you must come forward with a very ill grace to instruct the world in its invariable principles. Horace advises us to choose a subject *æquam viribus;* and to consider maturely

——————— quid ferre recusent,
Quid valeant humeri.

I fear, Sir, you forgot this precept of Horace when Mr. Campbell, as you say, forced you into this "idle controversy, by totally misrepresenting your statements;" for as these principles are utterly indefensible, the only evil that could result from Mr. Campbell's mistake was the substitution of one error for another. If he even understood you aright, your principles would still be erroneous: if he mistook you, he could only attribute one error to you instead of another. But to return to the "Sibyl's Temple," perhaps you will reply, that this description of it is not poetical, because the subject it describes is a work of art. The fallacy of this reply will be rendered obvious, by the following description of Melrose Abbey, by Walter Scott. It is a description which, I have no doubt, you will acknowledge to be poetical; and yet the subject is a work of art, and much less beautiful than the far-famed temple of the Sibyl:

If thou wouldst view fair Melrose aright,
Go visit it by the pale moon-light;
For the gay beams of lightsome day
Gild but to flout the ruins gray.
When the broken arches are black in night,
And each shafted Oriel glimmers white;
When the cold light's uncertain shower,
Streams on the ruin'd central tower,
When buttress and buttress alternately,
Seem framed of ebon and ivory,
When silver edges the imagery,
And the scrolls that teach thee to live and die;
When distant Tweed is heard to rave,
And the owlet to hoot o'er the dead man's grave;
Then go—but go alone the while,
Then view St. David's ruined pile;
And, home returning, soothly swear,
Was never scene so sad and fair.

Is it not obvious, from this description of Melrose Abbey, compared with that of the Sibyl's temple, by Mr. Knight, that what renders a description poetical, must be something different from the real qualities of the object described; as it belongs to the poet to find this something out, as it is the manner in which he describes, that renders his description poetical, it follows, contrary to your invariable principles, that a more beautiful is not more poetical, than a less beautiful object, as neither one nor the other is poetical in the least degree, abstracted from the manner in which it is handled by the poet. A beautiful object is not therefore "poetical *per se.*"

But you will reply, that the images of beautiful and sublime objects will be more poetical than images drawn from any other objects, though their prototypes in nature are not poetical in themselves. If so, I would simply ask, why beauty or sublimity should render an image poetical, when it does not render the object of which it is an image, poetical in the least? Can you answer this question? I apprehend not, for the following very obvious reason:—A poetical image, or any image presented to us through the medium of writing, whether poetry or prose, is only the image or idea, which the writer's description conveys to us of the object described; but as it is not the description which conveys the most correct likeness of the original, that is found to be the most poetical; in fact, as such a description would not be poetical at all; it follows, that poetical images are not the real images of the objects described, whether they be sublime or otherwise. The sublimity of the object, therefore, cannot render its image poetical, because a faithful representation of a sublime or any other object will not be poetical in the least. The very attempt to describe a sublime object as it exists in nature, destroys every thing like poetry in the description, nor would such a correct delineation only render the description unpoetical, but even destroy the sublime effect. At the same time, it must be recollected, that no image can properly be called an image of a certain object, if it be not a correct one, that is, if it presents the object to us more or less beautiful, more or less sublime than it exists in nature.

Your theory, Sir, would confine poetry to sublime, beautiful, and picturesque descriptions; but poetry will not be restricted to such limits. The poet, indeed, frequently delights in exciting the emotions of the sublime and beautiful: the picturesque, if understood in its most extended acceptation, does not entirely fall within his province. Of the picturesque, however, I must not say more at present, as the subject would carry me far beyond the limits of an epistle; but I would not pass it over so briefly, were it not that I have been for some time past engaged in preparing for the press a work on the sublime, the beautiful, and the picturesque, in which I shall have an opportunity of explaining myself fully on the subject of picturesque description, and of its alliance with poetry. It matters, however, but little, so far as regards your theory, whether the picturesque be, or be not, solely and exclusively the inheritance of the poet alone; because it requires little philosophy or experience to perceive, that poetry, so far from confining itself to descriptions that excite only emotions of sublimity, beauty, and picturesqueness, extends its empire over all the affections, passions, sensations, emotions, sympathies, and sensibilities of man. It is peculiarly the province of the poet to probe the inmost recesses of the heart; to watch all its secret movements and vibrations, and the still more secret and less perceptible causes from which they originate; to trace the varying aspect which different passions assume in different characters, under the diversified influences of times and situations; and from the knowledge which he acquires through this commerce with the heart, to create such images of material being, and to connect and associate them in description by such moral and intellectual relations, as are best qualified to call into action the immediate passions, emotions, or sympathies which he intends to excite.

This, Sir, is my view of Poetry, and in taking this view of it, I am led to conclude, that *in Poetry there is no quality, property, or attribute of a subject supposed to be feigned.* I am aware that Bacon and many writers, have supposed fiction to be the soul of poetry; and even those who consider fiction not absolutely essential to it, are willing to grant, that it is one of its chief and distinguishing characteristics. It is the business of the poet, as I have already observed, to place such images before us as awaken the immediate emotions which he loves to excite. If he aims to excite a grand and sublime idea, he selects from the object which he describes only such qualities as associate with our ideas of grandeur and sublimity, and carefully conceals all the other qualities that belong to the object. He must not, however, attribute qualities to the object described which the mind has no difficulty in perceiving cannot belong to it; for the mind immediately revolts at imposition, and the detection of the fraud destroys the sublime effect. Hence it is that we cannot endure at present poetic images drawn from the slightest mixture of Christian and Pagan mythology, though we are enraptured with Pagan images in the works of Pagan writers, because we place ourselves in their situations, and feel as they had felt. We know, it is true, that their images and relations are all fictitious, but we know at the same time that they themselves sincerely believed in them, and such is the force of sympathy, that we have no feeling of our own at the moment but what we imagine was felt by our honest but credulous ancestors. In poetry then the mind will endure no qualities to be ascribed to things, no images depicted of them, and no circumstance related of them, which has the slightest appearance of being feigned. It is true the poet is continually feigning, continually attributing qualities, properties, and affections to objects, which they do not possess; but then he industriously conceals this fiction from the mind, and he is careful to ascribe no quality to an object but what it possesses, or what the mind has no difficulty in attributing to it. It is in this his art chiefly lies; for if he attributes a quality to an object which the mind perceives at a glance cannot belong to it, the charm is destroyed, the poetry is destroyed, and we turn from it with disgust. This is the true source of the false sublime in poetry. The poet whose judgment does not keep pace with his imagination, imagines qualities in objects which men of ordinary perceptions and common sense would never suppose them capable of possessing. Accordingly, in describing these objects, clothed in these ennobling qualities, he presents us with a picture, which he expects will fill us with grand and sublime emotions, but which we instantly turn from with aversion; and such pictures we denominate by the name of bombast, or the false sublime. In poetry, then, the mind will endure no images of things that have the appearance of being feigned, though the poet may introduce the most palpable fictions, if he has art enough to introduce them so ingeniously as not to carry the evidence of their fictitious character along with them. This, if I be not mistaken, is the true nature of poetry; and while the poet keeps it in view, he will always know how far he may deviate from strict and literal truth. All writers acknowledge, that even in the most feigned part of poetry, we must not deviate too far from truth; but the exact limits to which the wanderings of the poet ought to be circumscribed, have not been precisely determined. It is true that fictions in poetry will not endure philosophic investigation, for a little consideration will enable us to perceive, that the poet has imposed upon us; but we are satisfied with the imposition, provided it be not detected intuitively and without any exercise of the understanding. The poet, however, though he is not permitted to ascribe qualities, &c. to objects, which the mind cannot suppose them capable of possessing, may feign an object that has no existence in nature; but the moment he gives us a general idea of its nature and character, he is no longer permitted to ascribe qualities to it which do not obviously agree with this nature and character; so that in all cases whatever, the mind will endure no qualities, attributes, properties, affections, or circumstances, to be attributed to objects, which it intuitively perceives cannot belong to them. It matters, however, but little, that philosophy, or even a slight exercise of common sense, should afterwards discover the illusion; for we may know from the commencement, that the poet is imposing upon us; but, notwithstanding this knowledge, we are offended with him the moment he suffers us to detect the imposition. The truth is, that there is more pleasure derived from the appearances, than from the realities of things, and, therefore, truth is seldom so agreeable as fiction. But though we wish to grasp at pleasure, in whatever shape it presents itself, we always love to conceal this wish from ourselves; and we cannot endure the poet who, while he professes to please us, discovers every moment, by his want of art, that all the pleasure he imparts is founded in delusion. I am aware that Mr. Campbell says, "fiction in poetry is open and avowed;" and so it is, in that qualified sense which I have here explained; nor do I think it can be inferred from the spirit of his "Lectures on Poetry," that he used the terms "open and avowed" in an unlimited and unrestricted meaning.

I have made these observations on the nature of poetry and poetic images, to show that they are very distant from mere beauty, sublimity, and picturesqueness; and that, if it be sense to say, "every thing sublime is poetical," it is equally sense to say, every thing ridiculous is poetical; for it belongs to poetry and to the poet to excite the emotion or sense of ridicule, as well as the emotion or sense of sublimity. In a word, poetry, as I have already observed, extends its influence over all the affections, passions, sensations, emotions, sympathies, and sensibilities of man. If the poet wishes to excite a sublime emotion, he selects from the object which he describes such qualities only as associate with our ideas of sublimity; or if the object should be destitute of these qualities, he confers them on it, or at least such of them as the mind may suppose capable of belonging to it. If he wishes to excite the sense of ridicule, he selects, as before, the most ridiculous circumstances that can be attributed to the object, and renders his description highly poetical, though the object he describes is highly ridiculous. Yet it would be as proper to say, that whatever is ridiculous is consequently poetical, because poetry is so well calculated to excite an emotion of ridicule, as to say, that whatever is sublime or beautiful, is consequently poetical, because poetry is so well qualified to excite the emotions of the sublime and beautiful. But I would ask, Sir, what emotion, affection, or passion, that ever agitated the breast of man, is not as much under the dominion of poetry, as the emotions of sublimity, beauty, and ridicule? There is no passion natural to the breast of man, to which there are not corresponding qualities in natural objects; and the moment these objects are presented to us, clothed in these qualities, the corresponding passion is immediately summoned into action. If the poet wishes to excite the sense of *fear*, he exclaims, with Collins:—

"Ah! Fear, ah! frantic Fear!
I see, I see thee near.
I know thy hurried step, thy haggard eye,
Like thee, I start, like thee, disorder'd fly;
For lo! what monsters in thy train appear.
Danger, whose limbs of giant mould
What mortal eye can fix'd behold?
Who stalks his round, a hideous form,
Howling amidst the midnight storm;
Or throws him on the rigid steep
Of some loose hanging rock to sleep:
And with him thousand phantoms join'd,
That prompt to deeds accurs'd the mind;
And those the fiends, who, near allied,
O'er Nature's wounds and wrecks preside;
While Vengeance, in the lurid air,
Lifts her red arm, exposed and bare,
On whom that ravening brood of fate,
Who lap the blood of sorrow, wait.
Who, Fear, this ghastly train can see,
And look not madly wild like thee?"

How excellently does the poet select in this ode such images as best associate with our ideas of fear, and who would refuse to acknowledge that this picture of fear is highly poetical? Yet fearful and poetical were never considered as synonymous terms, though they are just as nearly allied to each other as beautiful and poetical. Proceed then, Sir, through the whole catalogue of the passions; bring forward hope, joy, pity, grief, jealousy, envy, indignation, anger, hatred, love, &c., and you will find *them all* as nearly allied to poetry as either beauty or sublimity; for the tie by which they are all connected to poetry is the same. *And it* does not require a moment's consideration to perceive that a greater part of the passions are connected with, and elicited by, *the* works of art, that is by the productions and creations of our own hands, because our interests are more immediately connected with them, than by the sublimer works of nature. If you merely wanted to prove, that the works of nature were more sublime and beautiful than the works of art, few, I believe, would dispute the question; but to say that they are more poetical, and consequently more characteristic of poetical pre-eminence, is, I trust, sufficiently proved, to discourage you from resuming the defence of it in future.

When Gray describes the Eagle,

Sailing with supreme dominion
Through the azure deeps of air,

he gives a description eminently poetical. But is it the Eagle itself that is poetical? certainly not; for if it were, it would be poetical to say, "the Eagle, however hungry, never feeds on putrid bodies." If the name of the Eagle be poetical, it must be so wherever it occurs. Neither can we call the image which the poet conveys of the Eagle poetical; for he who never saw or heard of an eagle before he read this description, could form no image of him whatever, except that he would know him to be a bird, from his flying through the air. If I say, "the Eagle is about forty inches in length; the bill is blue, and the eye yellow; the legs are of a dirty yellow color, and feathered on the toes, the plumage is a mixed brown and rust color; the tail is clouded with ash color at the base," I enable a person who never saw or heard of an Eagle, to form an image of him in his own mind; but this image is not in the least degree poetical, though it is extremely correct. If then Gray has rendered the Eagle

> Sailing with supreme dominion
> Through the azure deeps of air

poetical, it is not because he has drawn his image from nature; for if he said, "the Eagle is a bird of prey," the image would be as much from nature as in the former case. The poetry of these two lines must not therefore be traced to a mere abstract, or *per se* image from nature; for such an image was never poetical; but must be sought for alone in the associations which they convey to the mind. The language of poetry is the language of pleasing associations, and the images introduced into it, whether taken from nature or from art, never please by themselves; or, as you express it, *per se*, but derive all their poetry, and the pleasures which they impart, from the relation which the poet creates between them, or, in other words, from the manner in which he connects and associates them with each other. These associations, so far from being suggested to the mind by the images considered apart, are not even suggested by the mere act of bringing them together; for if you were to select a thousand of what you would deem the most poetical images in nature, these thousand could be so introduced into verse, that you would instantly acknowledge they had not the remotest claim to the character of poetry, though the images should be so introduced, that nothing absurd or inconsistent could be pointed out in the thought or expression. This, however, could not possibly be effected if the images, as you assume, were poetical in themselves. On the other hand, if the same number of the most unpoetical images which you could draw from the works of art, were brought into verse by a poet of refined taste and genius, he would render them more poetical, or, at least, he would produce a finer poem from these unpoetical materials, than a writer who had no genius for poetry could fabricate out of the most poetical images in nature. I doubt whether

Locke or Newton could produce a poem, that is, a poem that could be called poetry, in the strict sense of the expression, out of the most poetical images or materials with which the whole range of nature could supply them. In poetry, therefore, the subject is nothing—the materials are nothing—the images are nothing: all depends on the *execution;* all depends on the *manner* in which the artist brings his images together, and not on the images themselves.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

OBSERVATIONS

ON

TRADE,

CONSIDERED

IN REFERENCE, PARTICULARLY, TO

THE PUBLIC DEBT,

AND TO

THE AGRICULTURE

OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

BY RICHARD HEATHFIELD,

AUTHOR OF "ELEMENTS OF A PLAN FOR THE LIQUIDATION OF THE PUBLIC DEBT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM," AND OF "FURTHER OBSERVATIONS ON THE PRACTICABILITY AND EXPEDIENCY OF LIQUIDATING THE PUBLIC DEBT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM."

LONDON:

1822.

VOL. XX. *Pam.* NO. XXXIX. K

OBSERVATIONS

ON

TRADE,

&c.

The Reader to whom the practicability of Liquidating the Public Debt may be the subject of peculiar interest, is referred to the Appendix D.

UNIVERSAL peace and good-will, would render laws unnecessary for the *regulation of trade.* If the benevolent principle bore universal and unlimited sway, all regard to partial or particular interest would merge in a comprehensive sense of the interest of the whole.

But the unhappy influence of the malevolent principle narrows human action into a system of caution and guard: the best directed efforts of benevolence are contracted into limit in their application, not by the finite nature of human power only, but by the dictates of prudence and experience.

It is however not the less clear, that all human action not originating in the benevolent principle, *is defective;* and in reference to this axiom of universal application, the intercourse of domestic and foreign trade becomes a subject of moral interest, co-extensive with its political importance.

The various productions of nature and of art stimulate industry by the desire of possession, and administer to the wants, the comfort, and the refinement of mankind. *The encouragement of labor,* and the *easy exchange of property,* subject to the limitation only which the necessity of human affairs prescribes, are, therefore, principal objects of legislation and government.

The limit which this necessity, duly considered, prescribes to the intercourse of trade, in the instance of Great Britain, may be reduced to two considerations; namely,

National Protection, and Constancy of Individual Pursuit or employment.

And the more extended the interchange of the products of labor and ingenuity can be rendered, without imprudent hazard in these respects, the more will the law by which man is bound to love his neighbour as himself be fulfilled.

For *Protection*, the United Kingdom depends chiefly upon maritime power. The encouragement of British navigation is therefore essential to all the political calculations of British trade.

And as the United Kingdom depends for internal peace, order and satisfaction, upon maintaining an even and uninterrupted course in the direction and application of capital and of labor, the consideration of *Constancy of Individual Pursuit,* or the stability or fixedness of her various relations, should be entertained with anxious solicitude. These various relations are;

The reciprocal relations within the limits of the *British Isles.*

The reciprocal relations of the several parts or members of the *Empire,* comprehending all countries under the British dominion.

And the relations of the British Empire with Foreign countries.

The soil, climate, population, and marine position, are the chief elements of political power.

Industry is the active and moving principle, which renders these several elements of power productive and effective.

The *British Empire* possesses *within itself,* to an extent without example, these elements of power, in a state of combination peculiarly favorable to the excitement of industry, and to the development of the means of protecting the property which becomes the effect of industry. The soil and climate, the minerals, the fisheries, the insularity of the United Kingdom; the variety of soil, climate, production and the *maritime distance* of the British possessions and dependencies, in North America, in the Antilles, in New Holland, in Asia, in Africa, and at the entrance and in the Isles of the Mediterranean Sea; and the numerous people who inhabit these countries—laborious, inventive, enterprising and persevering, present a combination unparalleled in the History of Nations. It is the province of the Statesman, to develop these vast resources; and however extensive the object may be, an attentive and undeviating regard to first principles will produce a *simplicity of action,* the least exposed to the risk of error or miscarriage.

Considered in reference to the intercourse of trade, a due regard to first principles would require *that duties and taxes* should be limited, throughout the Empire, *to the proper annual expenses* of the State, and of the several local Governments; that the readiest and least expensive communication, by means of roads, bridges, internal navigation and docks, should be provided; that the ports and harbours of the kingdom should be the subject of careful attention and improvement; *that the utmost facility should be accorded to the transmarine British carrier,* and that the laws of export and import, throughout the *Empire,* should be consistent and uniform in principle, and clear and distinct in application. A system which appearing to consult the interests of the individual only, would result in the great advancement of the State in effective power and authority, and would practically illustrate the principle of "Free Trade," by modes of application to which exception cannot be made.

Reciprocity of advantage is implied in the exchanges of property which constitute *Trade.*

The exchanges of the produce of the *Country* for the productions of the *Town, within the British Isles,* are of reciprocal advantage to the cultivator and to the artificer and manufacturer, and consequently, are beneficial to the nation.

The exchanges of property *between the British Isles* and the *British possessions and dependencies in North America, in the Antilles, in Asia and elsewhere,* are of reciprocal advantage to the several members of the Empire engaged in this intercourse.

The exchanges of property *between the several parts or members of the Empire and Foreign countries,* are of reciprocal advantage to the British and to the Foreign subject, and consequently to the respective countries.

But although all these exchanges are of reciprocal advantage; although the United Kingdom is benefited by each of these classes of exchanges of property, a clear distinction arises in respect of each class.

In the instance of the exchange of property between the *Country* and the *Town, within the British Isles,* ALL the parties receiving advantage are British; the British advantages are *double* in every instance of such exchange, and the interests which are thus created, are in the heart of the Empire: to the extent to which these interests can be carried and sustained, they are identified with the existence of the Empire, they are of the most constant and permanent character, and their prosecution and extension tend to promote the home or coasting navigation, and thus to create a national arm for *protection,* in the seamen who are, by these means, brought into activity.

In the instance of the exchange of property *between the British Isles,* and the *British possessions and dependencies in the various parts of the globe,* all parties receiving advantage are *British subjects:* the *British* advantages are again *double* in every instance of such exchange. In respect, however, of the advantages acquired by the dependent member of the Empire, and which become *located or fixed therein*, the benefit is *less certainly permanently* British, than in the instance first mentioned, of the intercourse *within the British Isles;* because the dependent country may cease to be a British dependency. But in counterpoise of this disadvantage, so long as the connexion be maintained and continued, *the interchanges being effected through the medium of British shipping,* the national arm for *protection* is invigorated and strengthened, in a degree *commensurate with the distance of the dependency*, the salubrity of its climate, and the bulk of the commodities interchanged.

In the instance of the exchange of property between the *several parts or members of the British Empire and Foreign countries*, the intercourse, under different degrees of probability, *is liable to interruption ; one only* of the parties receiving advantage is *British*, the advantages are divided in the varying proportions of the varying circumstances and different relative situations of each of these Foreign countries to the United Kingdom ; and it is to be well observed, that the intercourse with some Foreign countries is conducted chiefly in *British shipping*, the intercourse with other Foreign countries, on the contrary, is conducted *chiefly or entirely in Foreign shipping.*

Here then are guides which leave no question as to the policy of giving the utmost facility and encouragement to the interchanges of property, *within the United Kingdom*, and which indicate distinctly, the motives for facilitating such interchanges, *between the several parts or members of the Empire.*

The expediency of extending equal encouragement or of applying the principle of "Free Trade," in the same latitude, to the intercourse of trade extending beyond the limits of the British Empire, or to *Foreign trade*, is not equally clear. In a state of "Universal peace and good will," the principle of "Free Trade" ought to command universal assent. Under the unhappy disposition of man to usurp the rights of man, and of Nations to give body and force to this disposition, it must be subjected to prudential calculation.

The principle of "Free Trade," in its unlimited application, merges the distinction between *British* Agriculture and *Foreign* Agriculture, between *British* Navigation and *Foreign* Navigation. Losing sight of these distinctions, and of the distinction between a *constant* and an *irregular* course of demand and supply, its advocates assume, that the immediate rate of the money price of commodities may be allowed to govern the dealer and consumer, without regard to any other consideration ; and they, of course, contend, that this system of action would the most effectually advance every British Interest. The conclusion appears to be too general ; but even in respect of *Foreign Trade*, the nearest approximation to the principle of "Free Trade," consistent with the considerations of *National Protection* and *Constancy of Individual Pursuit*, cannot be too ardently desired nor too sedulously promoted. [See Appendix A.]

Preparatory to a more connected view of the subject under consideration, three important changes, which have occurred during the last fifty years, of a decided character in their bearing upon Production, Trade and Navigation, will be noticed;—incidental to which, some observations will be offered upon the nature and effects of *Market*.

The changes to be noticed, are;—

The change of most of the dependent British provinces of North America, to independent and rival maritime States.

The abolition of the British trade in slaves.

And the change *from comparatively low, to high constituents of cost, in respect of the agricultural productions of the United Kingdom.*

Each of the two first mentioned of these changes; namely, the change of most of the dependent British provinces of North America to independent and rival maritime States, and the abolition of the British trade in slaves, constituted a great, decided and permanent change in the relative position of Great Britain, and required a decided change in the course of her policy. Without changing her political maxims, a clear and decided alteration in the *application* of those maxims, appears to have been required. The principles which indicated the expediency of such alteration, appear, however, to have been recognised of late only. Upon the representations, indeed, which have proceeded from merchants, and other parties, actuated by a sense of particular interest, partial changes have received the sanction of the Government and of the Legislature; but until the act of the last session of Parliament, "for the further regulation of trade to and from places within the limits of the charter of the *East-India* Company," by which British ships are permitted to sail from the place of Asiatic growth to the country of consumption *generally*, the *principles* upon which such changes were required, do not appear to have been apprehended with the *strength*, and applied with the *effect*, required by their *latent power* and *practical* importance.

Whilst the United States of America were dependencies of the British Empire, the British Government, with great clearness and strength of judgment, encouraged the Agriculture and Navigation of those countries; the plantations in which were emphatically called "British Plantations," and the ships of these British dependencies were entitled to the privilege of a British register, as the shipping of the American provinces continuing under the British Government, still are.

The West Indies and Great Britain, and the Continent of Europe, *through Great Britain,* presented markets for their produce; the staples of which were provisions, lumber, ashes, tobacco, and rice.[1] And to the supply of these markets, the planters and merchants assiduously directed their attention, in all the particulars which are calculated to promote a current and advantageous sale.

Thus possessed of the markets of the West Indies and of Europe, the change in these States from "British Plantations," giving employment to British capital and British shipping, *to independent and rival maritime States,* does not appear to have been met by sufficient regard to the remaining resources of the British Empire. When the plantations or farms of Virginia, Georgia and South Carolina ceased to be British, in respect both of produce and shipping, extensive supplies of cotton wool, rice, and probably tobacco, might have been obtained from the British Asiatic provinces, not only for the supply of Great Britain, and the dependencies of the British Empire wherein such productions were required, but also for the supply of the continent of Europe, *at less than the American prices.*

But it does not appear that upon the acknowledgment of the Independence of the United States of America, any greater facilities of intercourse with the British Asiatic provinces were accorded to the British merchant; the British intercourse with those extensive, productive and cheap countries, continued in monopoly to the East India Company,[2] and that monopoly held the British trade with India in *severe check.*

When the British trade in slaves was abolished, *British* Tropical Agriculture[3] in the West, *became limited to the then actual extent of British cultivation.* The estates in cultivation no longer admitted of increase, either in number or extent, because fresh supplies of capable laborers were forbidden to the British planter.

This limitation does not, however, prescribe a limit to *demand* for the produce of Tropical countries; the disposition to the consumption of sugar, coffee and other Tropical produce, and the ability to purchase such commodities remained unaffected by the determination of the British Nation, not to extend the cultivation of the British possessions in the West. The demand for Tropical productions, so far from being reduced, is increasing, particularly with the increasing population of the two continents of America.

---

[1] Very little *Cotton-wool* was grown in North America until after the declaration of American Independence.

[2] It is not intended to convey any other than respectful sentiments of the East India Company, under whom the great fabric of the British Asiatic Government has arisen. Still, however, it has happened that the very expensive shipping system of the Company, and their management of the commercial property of private traders, until gradually broken down by the substitution of the present more enlarged and liberal system, nearly excluded all East Indian produce of great bulk, compared with its value, from the European market, through the medium of the British flag.

[3] The words "Tropical Agriculture," as used in this Essay, are not intended to be confined to their strict geographical sense, but to include the countries on either side of the Tropics in the hotter climates.

When *this* limit to the British employment of slaves, and consequently to British shipping, was imposed, national compensation was again presented in the British Asiatic provinces.

Those provinces present an inexhaustible resource for sugar, and, it is presumed, coffee, *at prices against which it would be impracticable to mantain successful competition by means of the labor of slaves.*[1] The Act of the last session, already mentioned, permitting a direct commercial intercourse, in British ships, between the British ports in Asia and the world generally, at length recognises, and to great extent applies, the principles of British policy, to the circumstances occasioned by the change of relation in the American provinces and by the abolition of the Slave Trade, and affords a reasonable ground of expectation, not only that the British Flag will continue ascendant, but that the demand for slave labor, will decline in the Foreign Settlements. [See Appendix B.]

The third and last change to be noticed, namely, the change from comparatively low, to high constituents of cost, in the cultivation of the United Kingdom, has very considerably, but it may be hoped not *permanently*, affected the United Kingdom in her powers of production, and in all her trading and commercial relations.

In particular, this change has already very considerably lowered, and threatens further to lower the impulse to the growth of British corn, and also threatens the most destructive effects to the British land-owner and farmer, from the importation of Foreign corn.

The consideration of the nature and effects of *Market*, will lead to the more distinct apprehension of this subject, and will illustrate the subject of trade generally.

A *beneficial* market is the first and last object of Political Economy: a beneficial market excites to enterprise and exertion by the promise of advantage which it offers; a beneficial market accords the return to active capital, compensation to labor, and rent to the proprietor of the soil. These advantages must be derived from the *market*, or they cannot be enjoyed.

The causes which, without having recourse to bounties or restrictive laws, dispose to a market becoming and continuing beneficial, are;—

---

[1] The difference in the *quality* of the products of the East and West will be noticed hereafter.

Skill in cultivation and preparation for sale—Capital—Consumption or demand—*Low constituents of cost*—Low charges of transit.

The causes which, on the contrary, indispose to a market becoming or continuing beneficial, are;—

Deficiency of skill in cultivation or preparation for sale—Deficiency of capital—Deficiency of consumption or demand—*High constituents of cost.*—High charges of transit.

The British Empire comprehends, in a very high degree, the means necessary to the enjoyment of *beneficial markets.*

The impediments to the exercise and exertion of those means, now existing, very greatly reduce or wholly prevent the enjoyment of that advantage.

The cultivation of the British Isles *is skilful;* the capital determinable to that object *abundant;* most of the costs of *production* and *transit* depending upon *individual enterprise*, and upon *the ingenuity and skill of the artificer and manufacturer*, are low; and the *consumption* or *demand for corn*, (whatever may be the *present* effect of the productive harvest of the year 1820) through a considerable length of time, *has exceeded the native growth or supply.*[1] But although the market for corn might, upon these considerations, be expected to have been singularly beneficial, the *high costs and charges* of *production* occasioned, chiefly, by the present system of *duties, taxes and rates*, derange the economy of this great market of the country, and deprive ALL, either directly or indirectly dependent upon it, of the ease, satisfaction, and *power to stimulate a spirit of enterprize,* which they would otherwise enjoy and command, and in general would exert.

The average prices of the British market for corn, very far exceed the prices of corn in the markets of the world generally; and a high average price is in some measure assured, by checking the introduction of Foreign corn to the British market. The price thus assured to the British grower is *more* than adequate to the costs of production, including rent, *if the public annuities and the maintenance of the capable poor be abstracted.*

These claims being remitted, considerable reduction in the prices of corn and other commodities might by degrees be experienced, as the *costs* of production should subside, consistently with the restoration of the farmer to a condition to make a liberal return of rent to the landlord.

The principle which deprives the British market for agricultural produce, of a character beneficial to the landlord or tenant, *inheres in the levy of the money required for the payment of the public annuitant.* The effect of this principle, upon the costs of production, cannot be estimated by the mere numerical amount of the annuities paid to the public creditor; nor by the combined amount of these annuities, of the Sinking Fund, of the charges of collection and management, and the advance which is necessarily made by merchants and dealers upon the duties paid by them.[1]

---

[1] The average quantity of wheat and flour added to the consumption of the country from the importation of Foreign wheat and flour for the years 1815, 1816, 1817, 1818, and 1819, being five years of peace, was 477,738 quarters. See Appendix C.

These several particulars may be taken in round numbers as follows:

Amount of annuity and interest on Unfunded Debt payable to the public - - - - - - -	32 millions
Sinking Fund (reduced from 17 millions) -	5
Expenses of collecting and charges of management, 7½ per cent. on 40 millions, - - - -	3
Advance made by the merchant, manufacturer, and dealer, upon duties paid under the heads of Customs and Excise, 25 per cent. on 40 millions, -	10
	50 millions.

Unfortunately, however, this aggregate, although it shows that the consumer ought to pay *fifty* millions, in respect of *thirty-two* millions to be paid to the public creditor, exhibits only a small part or proportion of the *effect* of the system of public annuities upon the costs of production, and consequently upon *market.*

Fifty millions added to, or combined with, the cost of the several commodities subject to duties of Excise and Customs, require an advance in the price of *such commodities* to that extent. The consumer does, *or should,* through the medium of these commodities, pay the sum of fifty millions; unquestionably a very considerable sum: but the simple addition of fifty millions *to the cost of the whole of the commodities vended within one year in the United Kingdom,* would not have added more than twenty per cent. to prices, computing the annual amount, previous to any advance on this account, at two hundred and fifty millions.

The great and destructive effect of this *primary* addition to money prices, upon *market,* is experienced in the action of *price upon price.* Malt, beer, spirits, wine, leather, salt, soap, candles, coals and other commodities require, in the aggregate, an increase of price to the extent of fifty millions. If this advance be paid, every consumer of these commodities, who commands any means of endeavour to remove the burthen from himself, at least attempts to advance the money price of whatsoever he may offer either to rent or to sell; the landlord to advance the rent of land, that he may in his receipts find a counterpoise to his additional expenditure; the tenant to advance the prices of agricultural productions, that he may recover the increase in the constituents of the costs of production: and a *favorable conjuncture*[1] enables these several parties to effect such purposes. The manufacturer, for the same reasons, *and in like manner*, advances the price of goods. The advance in money prices becomes *general*. *The attempt to regulate price by price is inseparable from the principle of barter, through the medium of a money price.*

---

[1] See "Further Observations on the Practicability and Expediency of Liquidating the Public Debt of the United Kingdom," *Pamphleteer,* vol. xvi. pp. 491—493.

If the supplies to a farm be increased in money price, through the direct operation of duties on such supplies, that increase of price *requires* an increase in the price of wheat and other produce; an increase in the price of wheat, *requires* an increase in the price of labor, and through the medium of labor an increase of price in every article of production in which labor combines. An increase of price in such productions *requires* a fresh and distinct advance in the price of wheat, and a further advance in wheat again *requires* an increase in the price of labor generally, and such further increase in the price of labor *should* re-act upon the price of wheat. *In like manner it is necessary that an increase of price should be communicated throughout the community.* The burthen of the duties which render necessary this new arrangement of prices, cannot be generalised or distributed, by the *simple addition of the amount of the duties*, or of the duties and the *concomitant charges*, but if effected, must be accomplished by means of the communication of the increase in price, experienced in respect of the objects directly taxed, to all national productions. Price *should be* communicated to price, or by one commodity to another, throughout the whole chain of dealing, and these increased prices act, or *should act and re-act*, one upon the other so as to effect the general and equal distribution of the burthen of the duties imposed.

The merits of this important topic may be tested thus;—

If the lands in cultivation, in the United Kingdom, be estimated at fifty millions of acres; the rate of price now *required* for the produce of the land, at six pounds per acre; and it be admitted that one *half* the *rates of price now required, only*, would have been *required* in the year 1790, if the country had then been entirely free from debt: it follows that in respect of the *produce of the land*, money prices ought to be increased in consequence of the Public Debt, by the addition of one hundred and fifty millions; to which must be added at least twenty millions for the greater price now required for manufactured goods and other commodities, through the operation of duties rendered necessary by the debt, besides the sum of fifty millions first mentioned, as being directly incorporated in the price of Excise and Customs articles. In the aggregate, TWO HUNDRED AND TWENTY MILLIONS, or SEVEN TIMES, nearly, the amount of the annuity paid to the public creditor. If the increase of price thus *required* be *obtained*, the evil is felt in the checks to industry, incident to a system of high prices. If the increase of price thus *required* be *not obtained*, the evil becomes aggravated, and fatal to the harmony and well-being of the community. The principle of JUSTICE, the very key-stone of the social union, is disturbed.

---

[1] The late war presented that favorable conjuncture.

Without claiming for this statement more than some approximation to truth, it is obvious that the distribution of the duties through the medium of money prices cannot proceed by the *simple addition* of any given amount of impost, but if effected, proceeds by the communication of price from one commodity or class of commodities to another, and again by the repeated action and re-action of these increased prices. *And it is equally obvious that British agricultural productions require at market, in the aggregate money price, an increase since the year* 1790, *very far indeed exceeding the simple or primary amount of the duties or duties and taxes, which have been imposed since that year, and that the increase of price required, although obtained under other circumstances,* CANNOT *now be obtained.*

The remedy for this great evil is plain and simple; namely, the practical application by the *community* as a body politic, of the principle already ingeniously and ably applied by the *individual*, of supplying the market with productions (the rights of the producer being reserved) *at the lowest possible constituents of cost.* The application of this principle in the conduct and direction of the *public business of the country*, would promptly and effectually restore the British market for the national produce, to a healthy and beneficial state.[1] The means of liquidating the claims of the public creditor, without which the present[2] heavy costs of production do not *fairly* admit of being materially lowered, are plain and easy, if the liquidation of the debt become the object of the concurrent will and desire of the nation. The liquidation of the public debt would clear the industry and dealings of the United Kingdom of the weight of two hundred millions and upwards in the money prices *required* for commodities; and the peculiar state of the country presents the means of effecting this object, without the risk of materially deranging the state and condition of property, or of society. [See Appendix D.]

---

[1] Applied to agriculture, it would admit and would lead to the highest rate of profit, and would of course admit of the division of profit necessary to maintain the proper rights and station of the landlord and tenant, and of sufficient and proper wages being paid to the husbandman.

[2] Autumn, 1821.

Under the advantage of these explanations, *the trade of the British Isles, the British trade with the dependencies of the Empire,* and *the Foreign trade,* will be considered in connexion, with a view to show the means of establishing each according to its order and bearing upon the interests of the community.

The productions of the earth are the bases of all trade, and the source of the wealth of nations.

The *British trade,* in common with the trade of all other nations, rests upon this foundation;—but the skill and industry of the British people in the prosecution of the useful arts, combined with the great means actually developed in the distant dependencies of the British Empire, enable them, not only to trade very actively within themselves, in the British Isles, and with these dependencies, but also with Foreign nations, in the products of art, as well as of nature.

It is sufficiently clear that exchanges of property, *within the limits of the British Isles,* comprehend in their nature and character, all the advantages, in respect of the national wealth and power, to be derived from trade: that the *trade of the British Isles with the dependencies of the Empire,* combines similar advantages in a very considerable degree: and it is also clear that the exchanges of property *between the British Empire and Foreign countries,* conduce to the national wealth and power, but in a *less* degree, and subject, in the instance of each Foreign country, to different and varying considerations.

By what means then can each of these important and intimately connected interests be advanced in its proper degree and proportion?

The whole of the agricultural and spontaneous productions of the British Empire, in the various parts of the globe, may properly be designated British productions, which again may be reduced to two parts or divisions; namely,

The Agricultural and spontaneous productions of the British Isles;

The Agricultural and spontaneous productions of the British dependencies.

The first are the foundation and chief *internal* sources, the second are the chief *external* sources, of the national wealth and power.

The national wealth and power are weakened and repressed in these principal sources;

By ***fiscal institutions*** **which exceed in their purpose the current** annual expenses of the State.

By *institutions or laws* which prevent the *direct* conveyance of these agricultural and spontaneous productions, from the country of production, to the country of consumption.

The *fiscal institutions* of the *United Kingdom* very considerably exceed in their character and extent, the provision necessary for the current annual expenses of the State; and, by the great amount required to sustain the system of public annuities, particularly by the action and re-action of price upon price, or the excessive costs of production incident to the system of public annuities, bear down and baffle the utmost efforts of industry, ingenuity and skill, in the cultivation of the British Isles;—sufficient price cannot be recovered at market to compensate labor, and to maintain the condition of the landlord and tenant. The excessive costs of production have actually cast the United Kingdom, in respect of its agriculture, into a state of severe depression, uneasiness, and distress.

The same cause affects the agricultural interests of the British dependencies,—which may be considered under four divisions;—namely,

The Western Tropical dependencies—the West-India Islands and Settlements.

The Eastern Tropical dependencies—in Asia, and in the Indian seas. [See Appendix E.]

The Northern dependencies—Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick.

The Southern dependencies—the Cape of Good Hope and New Holland, including Van Diemen's Land.

The agricultural interests of the Western Tropical dependencies are affected by the *high fiscal institutions*, or high revenue system of the United Kingdom, *not* by preventing the more extensive cultivation of those countries, because the law which prevents the further importation of African laborers, prescribes the limit to their cultivation;—but by lowering the profits and checking the prosperity of the planter.

The means by which the high revenue system of the United Kingdom produces these effects, appear to be;—

First. By repressing and lowering the extent and condition of the population of the *British Isles*, the chief market for the produce of the Western Tropical plantations.

Second. By the high duty on sugar and other productions of these dependencies, which cannot fail to check consumption.

Third. By the additional cost, incidental to the high revenue system, of the extensive annual supplies derived by these dependencies from the British Isles.

Fourth. By the additional expense of conveying the produce to market.

The high revenue system of the United Kingdom does not *equally* affect the agriculture of the British Tropical Eastern dependencies.

The cost of the Eastern Tropical productions does not materially depend upon British supplies; the demand for the British Eastern productions is more *general* than for the British Western productions; and the British market being secured, chiefly, to the Western planter, the Eastern planter is not affected by the numbers and condition of the British people, in *the same degree* as the Western planter. The high revenue system of the United Kingdom *does*, however, affect the agriculture of the British Eastern dependencies;—

By repressing and lowering the extent and condition of the population of the British Isles, and consequently preventing consumption of Tropical productions grown or found in the Eastern dependencies, and either *not* grown or found, or not in sufficient extent and variety, in the Western colonies.

By the increased charges and expenses of navigation.

By the increased charges on goods passing through the United Kingdom to Foreign countries.

The high revenue system affects the agricultural and native interests of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick;—

By repressing and lowering the extent and condition of the population of the British Isles.

By the additional cost of the extensive supplies derived by these countries from Great Britain.

By the additional expense of navigation, and charges in British ports.

And although similar causes do not *at present* operate to *much extent* in regard to the Cape of Good Hope, and New Holland, the objections arising from the high revenue system are the same in kind, in respect of these colonies.

The extension of the privilege of direct communication between the British dependencies in the other parts of the World, as well as from the British Ports in Asia, would tend to the increase of demand upon the agriculture of those dependencies; but whether such an extension of privilege be in any and what degree expedient, is a question involving many and various considerations, and must be determined, in each particular instance, by a careful examination in detail, and being of inferior importance, will not now be discussed.

It is sufficiently clear, then, that the interchanges of property within the British Isles, and between the several parts or members of the British Empire, and *the ease and satisfaction to arise therefrom,* will be commensurate with the relief of the country from the burthen of fiscal institutions, and consequently, that the liquidation of the PUBLIC DEBT is an object of common and general interest, to the British subject. Unless that impediment be removed, the principles upon which the prosperity of the Empire must depend, cannot be successfully reduced to application.

Great Britain never before commanded resources so vast. In her soil productive, in her minerals rich, in her ingenuity and *industry,* unrivalled; by her dependencies, combining the four quarters of the globe in one great commercial and maritime empire; gradually moulding *some* of her political institutions to new and extraordinary circumstances, she is required by every sound and reasonable motive to remove the CAUSE by which, notwithstanding her riches, her ingenuity and industry, her mighty combination of means, and her political skill and sagacity, she is deeply embarrassed, and is threatened with an accumulation of distress and misery.

An examination of the principles which apply to the FOREIGN TRADE of the United Kingdom will lead, by motives not *equally* powerful indeed, but by powerful and pressing motives, to the conclusion that the liquidation of the public debt is an object of deep interest in that bearing and relation.

The *trade of the British Empire with Foreign countries,* as well as the *trade within the British Empire,* has its source in agriculture, and spontaneous or natural productions.

As it is the proper business of every country to develop its internal resources, whence the national wealth and power are chiefly to be derived; the importations from Foreign countries, *which displace* the demand for Native productions, become the subject of anxious attention;—not in any narrow or confined spirit, not for the purpose of considering how the interest of a neighbour may be subjected to selfish views; but for the fair and becoming purpose of enquiring into the cause of an effect so adverse, not only to the interest of the particular nation which may be immediately and directly affected, but adverse to the general prosperity of nations.

The greater the opulence which Great Britain, for instance, may derive from her agriculture, and her other copious sources of wealth, the greater her consumption, the greater her demand for the productions of climates and countries yielding productions, which notwithstanding the most ample development of her own resources, she would require. Even the advocates for the importation of Foreign grain might, in the event, find the most extensive and satisfactory result, from a system the most effectual to the extension of British agriculture. The increase of population, and the improvement *in the condition* of the population, which would be incident to such a system, would probably, in all but very abundant seasons, render the importation of Foreign grain necessary; but whether *that* effect followed or not, the consumption of all materials of Foreign growth or production required for manufacture in the United Kingdom, and of Foreign luxuries not produced, or not produced in sufficient quantity within the Empire, would increase to great extent.

Such importations from a Foreign country are clear sources of benefit to the importing country, as well as to the exporting country;—

The grain, if required, because without *displacing* the demand for grain of native growth, it would supply the defect of crop arising from the course of seasons, or compensate for the inability of the country (if unable), in good seasons, to feed its population.

The materials for manufacture, as a medium in which to embody labor, and as affording the means of varying the excitement by which the circulation of money is quickened.

Luxuries, by prompting activity, through the desire of possession, and consequently, by again quickening circulation.

In like manner, a *Foreign country*, by developing its proper resources, becomes better enabled to supply and to purchase of Great Britain, and the latter country has, consequently, an interest in the prosperity of the Foreign country.

It does not however follow that it is eligible for Great Britain to *trade with a Foreign country* at the *expense* or *sacrifice* of her natural resources. A crisis may indeed be too readily supposed, which may render it doubtful whether such a Foreign trade be, or be not, the least *in the choice of evils;* but the existence of such a crisis must be admitted to be evidence of the depression of native industry, *and consequently of the national wealth and power being affected at the source.* Such a Foreign trade may be submitted to as a temporary expedient, but the consideration of its tendency must lead to an anxious solicitude to relieve the native industry.

Under the actual circumstances of the United Kingdom, relief of the native industry may *appear* to be presented in either of two opposite modes;—

By a system having for its object *the advance of the price of agricultural produce to the standard of the high costs of production.*

By a system having for its object the *reduction of the costs of production.*

The first mentioned system has been tried, and has *failed;* the United Kingdom *cannot* be wholly cut off from sympathy with the markets of Foreign Nations; and as *high* prices, if obtained by the agriculturist, render it necessary that high prices should be obtained *from* the agriculturist; as price *does*, or, in order to satisfy the ends of political justice, *ought* to engender price, the case cannot safely be supposed in which the effectual and permanent relief of British industry could be obtained by means of a system of *high prices*.

A system of *low constituents of cost*, on the contrary, would assure the accomplishment of its purpose.

That system, carried to sufficient extent, would render a moderate price for agricultural productions a *high bounty* upon production, and would stimulate the United Kingdom, and its vast dependencies, into the fullest and most beneficial activity: beneficial, not to the British Empire only, but to all Nations. That system would most effectually and permanently establish a system of interchange with Foreign countries, by enabling the British to supply the Foreign subject at the lowest rates of price consistent with the rights (as to profit) of the agriculturist and manufacturer, and by rendering necessary for the purposes of the British manufacturer, and for the general consumer, the largest importations of Foreign products.

The encouragement and extension of the *Foreign trade* of the United Kingdom, therefore, depend essentially upon the abandonment of the high revenue system, or the Liquidation of the Public Debt. Without the previous liberation of the trade, or of the interchange of property *within the British Empire*, from the heavy restraints imposed by the high revenue system, how can the freedom of *Foreign trade* become the subject of liberal and enlightened discussion (although considerable benefit may be derived from enquiry) with the probability of any result *effectual* to the well-being of the agriculturist, the merchant or trader, whether domestic, colonial, Foreign, or of any other character or description?

The "Free trade" required, is then——

First—The freedom of interchange of property within the British Isles, from the great and depressing weight produced by the subtle and various, the direct and indirect, the accumulated and aggravated action of the duties and taxes required for payment of the public annuities.

Second—The same freedom in respect of the interchange of property between the several parts or members of the British Empire.

Third—The utmost freedom in respect of the interchange of property between the British Empire and Foreign countries, consistent with the conservation and ascendancy of the British marine, and a reasonable regard to the stability or probable continuance of the Trade with the several Foreign countries.

The principle of "Free Trade," so applied, appears to be calculated to produce a greater sum of wealth, prosperity and *power*, than has ever been enjoyed, by this or any other Nation.—Each class, under this system, would advance the interest of each and of all classes, throughout the social polity; a general facility of interchange, throughout this Empire, would stimulate exertion, assure general abundance, and a constantly increasing consumption. The same principle, although modified, would, in its degree, produce the like effect in respect of the interchanges with *Foreign countries;* and the British Nation, in the enjoyment of her own vast resources, would illustrate by her example to all the Nations of the Earth, the excellence and the wisdom of an enlarged benevolence in political design and comprehensive simplicity in Political Institution.

APPENDIX A. (P. 6.)

The consequences of the *interruption of demand* in markets which the British manufacturer may be accustomed to supply, and of the *interruption of supplies of* the material for manufacture, for which he may be dependent upon Foreign countries, are of a grave and anxious description. The vast establishments by means of which, only, the United Kingdom is enabled to maintain competition in the sale of manufactured goods in Foreign markets, notwithstanding the high revenue system, cannot be suspended or even partially interrupted, without producing considerable inconvenience, loss and misery. The Nation has been repeatedly cast into a convulsive state, during the last thirty years, by the interruption of *Foreign demand* for goods of British manufacture, and of *Foreign supplies* of material for the manufacturer; and the exposure to similar calamities cannot be overlooked in any just estimate of the nature and value of *Foreign commercial connexion.* Constancy of pursuit in the individual, *is essential to the well-being of the community.* A trade with a country peculiarly exposed to the chances of interruption, cannot therefore be equally desired as a trade with a country not subject to the same chances. *Upon this principle,* a trade with Portugal, the Brazils, and other parts of South America, is to be sought and cultivated with solicitude, whilst a Trade with some other countries, may be viewed with comparative indifference.

The effect of conducting the interchanges of property in *British shipping,* is the invigoration of the arm upon which the United

Kingdom relies for protection and defence. The effect of conducting these interchanges in *Foreign shipping*, on the contrary, is the creation or invigoration of an arm, but too probably to be met, under a change of circumstances, in adverse and hostile contention. These distinctions cannot be overlooked in any comparative estimate of the nature and value of trade.

APPENDIX B. (P. 8.)

The British Nation, in abandoning the further transport of Africans from their native country, to labor as slaves in their plantations, could not have intended and really did not intend, to transfer to other and rival nations, the power in wealth and navigation, which results from the cultivation of the Tropical countries for commodities of great bulk, particularly sugar, to be consumed at considerable maritime distance from the place of growth. It could not consist with the humane purpose of the abolition of the British Trade in Slaves, and was not in fact intended, that the care of the unhappy African, upon the middle passage, should simply be transferred from the British trader, acting under the provisions of the British Legislature and the eye of the British Government, to Foreign Nations. But, notwithstanding the efforts which have been made by the British Government, to induce other countries to renounce this trade, and the extent to which it actually has been renounced by Foreign Nations, the transport of Africans from their native country, for the cultivation of the Western Tropical regions, is a practice still prevailing in great and dreadful energy.

APPENDIX C. (P. 9.)

An account of the quantities of wheat, and wheat flour, imported into Great Britain from Foreign parts, and also of wheat, and wheat flour, exported from Great Britain during each of the last five years, reducing the flour into wheat, at the proportion of 49lbs. of flour to the bushel of wheat, and showing the quantity thereof, that was added to the consumption of the country from excess of import.

	Wheat and flour imported from Foreign Parts.	Wheat and flour exported to all Parts.	Average price in England and Wales.
	Quarters.	Quarters.	per Quarter.
			s. *d.*
Year 1815	192,449	227,947	64. 4.
1816	209,654	121,610	75. 10.
1817	1,029,037	317,523	94. 9.
1818	1,582,878	58,668	84. 1.
1819	469,657	44,689	73. 0.
	3,483,675	770,437	
Deduct quantity remaining in warehouse on the 5th Jan. 1820, no stock being under the King's lock, at the commencement of the year 1815.	324,546		
	3,159,129		
Deduct quantity exported.	770,437		
	5) 2,388,692		
Average quantity added to the consumption of the country from excess of import.	477,738		

26th May, 1820. (Signed) WILLIAM IRVING.

APPENDIX D. (P. 13.)

THE proposal, which has for its object the relief of the productions and goods annually consumed in the United Kingdom, from an aggregate of *cost* equal, probably, to two hundred millions and upwards, cannot fail, from its magnitude, to be received with apprehension of an inconvenient and dangerous disturbance of the state and condition of property, and of society.

It may, however, with great ease be shown, that the alteration, with only slight exception, might be effected in a manner not only free from such consequences, but with the assurance of consequences *immediately*, and *generally* as well as *progressively*, beneficial.

The object contemplated, is the cessation of the demand of upwards of forty millions annually, chiefly duties of Excise and Customs.

The *immediate effect* of the repeal of the duties of *Excise*, or *joint* duties of *Excise* and *Customs*, would be beneficial to the dealer, because the duty on the stock on hand, which he might have paid to the Exchequer, would be returned to him; and to the public would be beneficial, because all future supplies of such descriptions of stock or goods would be obtained at proportionally less cost.

The repeal of duties of Customs, *simply*, would require more attentive consideration; but would admit of being accommodated to the convenience of the dealers in the several articles subject to such duties, who would have little difficulty in meeting any well considered proposal for the permanent relief of their respective trades, and of the community.[1] With regard to the *immediate* effect of the remission of these duties upon the consumer, there could not be any difficulty;—the relief would be general and effectual.

The *ulterior* effect in the reduction of the price of agricultural productions, requires to be met with some caution, and the regulation of the importation of Foreign grain appears to present adequate means for this purpose.

If the relation of supply and demand immediately regulate price, the introduction of Foreign corn to the British market admits of being so guarded, as to assure to the British grower a high and *beneficial* price, *provided the costs of production be not excessive.*

To this end it would be necessary that the standard of price which now governs the importation of *Foreign* grain, should not be lowered until the *costs* of *British* production should be *considerably lowered; until crops produced at the higher costs of production should have been consumed, and replaced by crops produced at*

---

[1] The *Excise* Board has an account of the *stock of goods* in the hands of dealers whereon duty has been paid, and the return of duty could therefore be easily regulated.

The Board of Customs does not keep a similar check.

costs clearly and distinctly admitting the competition of Foreign corn, at a rate somewhat lower than the present regulation admits; and in like manner, as the costs of production should still more subside, the regulation price of the importation of Foreign grain might be lowered from time to time, until a proper level should have been ascertained and fixed. By which order of proceeding, the price of corn might be sufficiently maintained to cover the costs of production and with the probable effect of affording a decided advantage, where every consideration, both individual and national, requires that the advantage should be given, namely to the landlord and tenant; because the reduction of the import regulation price, might be made gradually, and rather slowly, to *follow* the reduction of the costs of production; at all times assuring a reasonable and liberal rate of RENT.

In the operation of a few years, prices would, in this manner, subside to the lowest rate consistent with proper compensation to capital and labor, the adequate support of the Government of a great country, and the return of a *liberal* rent to the proprietor. The *costs of production* would be *low*, which would fairly and freely admit of the prices at market, *relatively to the costs,* being *high.*

Although eight shillings be *positively* a *high* price for a bushel of wheat, yet, *if the costs of production require nine shillings* it is *relatively* a *low* price, and such a state of market would be ruinous; whilst on the other hand, if the price were five shillings, and the costs of production four shillings, per bushel, the market would be beneficial. It does not admit of question, that the principle which directs the anxious reduction of the constituents of *cost,* whether such costs be, in their origin, *public* or *private,* is the foundation of the science of political economy.

The danger of a system of high constituents of cost, may be illustrated by considering the possible effect of a bad harvest upon the state of the country under the present circumstances.

On the supposition of forty shillings per quarter for wheat, being a sufficient price in good seasons, the excitement to importation by the Foreign merchant would not be sufficient to prevent an advance to 48*s.* 56*s.* and upwards, in the event of a bad harvest; the farmer would reap only two-thirds or half a crop, but he would obtain a proportional advance in price: concurrently with the disadvantages, he would have the advantages of a natural course of things. But not so in the actual state of things, in which a high comparative price (comparative as to neighbouring nations) for the quarter of wheat, *in good seasons,* does not adequately sustain the farmer. The high price, in the British market, strongly excites and stimulates the Foreign merchant: vast masses of grain are brought into British *ports*, in the anticipation of its admission into the British *market;* the difference between the price at which wheat can be imported, and the price which the British market yields, is a strong and perhaps irresistible impulse to store the British granaries with Foreign corn, upon the chance of its admission into the market. The Foreign granaries may at the same time be well supplied, under the like expectation. On the instant that the effect of the domestic calamity of a bad harvest, shall have been so felt as to have carried the periodical average to the price of 80*s*. per quarter, the farmer, so far from finding an alleviation of the misfortune of a short crop in an increase of price, might, by the large and instant supplies of Foreign grain thrown into the great maritime markets of the kingdom, particularly London, find, that although the price of 80*s*. had caused the ports to "open," the "opening of the ports" had again reduced the market price of wheat. Had the ports opened this season,[1] it is believed that half a million of quarters of Foreign wheat would have been released from the British granary. Whatever proportion half a million of quarters of wheat may bear to a year's consumption, the effect upon the market price cannot be measured by regard to that particular only: it may fairly be presumed that a large and concentrated supply would have an effect upon the market far more than commensurate with the mere question of relative quantity, and the half million of quarters now here, would presently have been followed by successive and larger supplies. If then it should happen that the British farmer could not realise eighty shillings per quarter, from a *bad harvest*, or that he could not even obtain a considerable advance upon eighty shillings under circumstances which ought to produce to him a very large advance, what would be the state of all British property?

Under such circumstances,

If the farmer could even pay rates and taxes, what expectation could the landlord (looking to the farmer's already reduced and altered state) entertain of obtaining *any* rent?

If the landlord do not obtain his rent, what must be the effect upon markets of every description, upon the manufacturer, ship-owner, and upon the revenue?

Is the supposition strained, that under such circumstances the public annuitant could not be paid?

And,

If not paid, what again would be the effect upon consumption, book debts, and the revenue? upon the Domestic and Foreign trade of the country?

---

[1] Autumn, 1821.

Or even if wheat *should* advance, contrary to the supposition now entertained, to 120*s*. and 130*s*. per quarter, what would be the effect of a correspondent price of bread, upon all classes and orders? and again, upon the Domestic and Foreign trade of the country?

The EARL OF LIVERPOOL, in the Speech which his Lordship delivered in the House of Lords, on the 26th of May, 1820, upon the motion of the Marquis of Lansdown;—" That a select committee be appointed to enquire into the means of extending and securing the Foreign trade of the country"—expresses himself as follows;—

" The Noble Marquis also truly says, that this general distress is to be ascribed to the *extraordinary convulsions* in Europe during the last twenty years; *convulsions* which unhinged all the natural relations between nation and nation, and even between man and man; *convulsions* which have produced the most extensive effects both on nations and individuals. Unquestionably, it was impossible but that the instability of property, the creation of fictitious capital, and all the other evils which arose during those *convulsions*, should operate in the production of great distress in every country, long after the re-establishment of peace should have caused the *convulsions* themselves to cease.

" But the peculiar circumstances of the times—that to which I wish particularly to direct the attention of your Lordships, and of the whole kingdom, is this,—that, great as the distress is in every country in Europe, (and certainly it prevails more or less in every country in Europe,) it is, nevertheless, at the present moment greater in the United States of America than it is in any country in Europe. I desire any of your Lordships, or any other individuals who may be disposed to ascribe the distress under which we at present labor, to our *debt*, to *excessive taxation*, to *tithes*, to the *poor-rates*, or to any cause of that nature, to look at the United States of America; and I think that they will then pause before they ascribe the distress which we, or any of the other countries of Europe, are now suffering, exclusively or principally, to any or all the causes which I have mentioned."

The opinions and sentiments of Lord Liverpool are invested with the authority of experience, of station, and of talent; and the deep impression produced, in particular, by his Lordship's Speech upon Lord Lansdown's motion, gives additional interest to the examination of the important topic of that speech embraced by the passage now cited.

Lord Liverpool states, that "great as the distress is in every country in Europe, it is nevertheless greater in the United States of America, than it is in any country in Europe," and then proceeds to desire Noble Lords, or any other individual, "who may be disposed to ascribe the distress under which we at present labor, to our *debts*, to *excessive taxation*, to *tithes*, to the *poor-rates*, or to any other cause of this nature, to look at the United States of America;" and his Lordship adds, "I think that they will then pause before they ascribe the distress which we, or any of the other countries of Europe are now suffering, exclusively or principally, to any or all the causes which I have mentioned."

An individual who *did* ascribe and who *continues to ascribe* the distress of this country to the *public debt, to excessive taxation*, and to the *poor-rates, has* paused and examined the argument thus publicly and generally addressed and directed, by the First Minister of the country.

He admits (his observations having reference to the date of his Lordship's Speech) that distress had been common to the United Kingdom, and to the United States of America; but although each country suffered distress, the two countries stood directly *opposed* to each other in *the particular the most essential to internal national* prosperity.

The United States of America *did not possess within themselves an adequate market for their agricultural productions*, and they were deprived, by the Peace, to considerable extent, of the external markets which they had been accustomed to supply.

The United Kingdom, on the contrary, as shown in Appendix C. cited from his Lordship's Speech, had enjoyed the great advantage of a market *within herself for more than the whole of her agricultural productions*,[1] and she had received in her own market a price very far exceeding the price of such produce in any other market of the world.

How then is a *similar effect* to be accounted for under the operation of causes so opposite? Some distinct, powerful, and *evil* principle, must be assigned to account for this correspondence in result, AND THAT PRINCIPLE IS DISCOVERABLE IN THE PUBLIC DEBT ONLY. What has occasioned the necessity of high prices in the markets of the United Kingdom for agricultural produce? What has deprived even very high prices for agricultural produce, of the power of adequately sustaining the farmer, the husbandman, and the land-owner? Does this gross anomaly admit of any other explanation than such as shall resolve itself into the operation of the Public Debt? No country in the world, the state of which is known and understood, is comparable with Great Britain, in the relative extent of market which she enjoys *within herself* for her agricultural productions. No country in the world possesses markets of equal opulence and power in the purchase and consumption of native agricultural productions. No country in the world is comparable to the United Kingdom, in the high proportion which the inhabitants of the town bear to the agricultural population.

---

[1] See Appendix C. p. 39.

Neither the state or condition of a distant and new country, nor the vibrations of the balance of Foreign trade, can adequately account for the agricultural distress of the nation under such circumstances. The cause is deep—seated within the country, and it operates by the increase and excessive aggravation of the *costs* of production, by means of the high revenue system incident to the Public Debt.

Mr. Malthus,[1] *at the same time declaring that he is far from being insensible to the evil of a great national debt* (p. 484) has at some length shown the effect which would follow from the abstraction from society (and consequently from the market for productions) of the *unproductive consumers,* who derive their income through the medium of the Public Debt; and under this view has advanced the opinion, that the evils incident to a public debt cannot be prevented, without subjecting the community to an evil of still greater magnitude, in the want of *unproductive consumers.*

With great deference to the authority of Mr. Malthus, it is submitted, that the consequence apprehended by him, although an unquestionable consequence of the use of the "sponge," or the *extinction* of that class of consumers, could not ensue from any *well-principled* and *systematic* liquidation of the Public Debt.

The number of consumers would, in such case, remain exactly the same, although the description or character of the public annuitant might be exchanged for that of a landholder, or mortgagee of land, *or* that of a creditor of a Bank of deposit, as proposed "Further Observations on the propriety and expediency of liquidating the Public Debt,"[2] or to some other description or character arising from the possession and command of property.

The public creditor or annuitant is *not* strictly speaking a *proprietor;* but considering him to be such, the liquidation of the Public Debt would neither add to the capital of the country, nor diminish the number of proprietors; although, in simplifying the circulation of money, it would vary the relation of the public annuitant from a position which bears destructively upon the best interests of the country, to some other relation *more* beneficial to *himself*, and of a benevolent aspect towards the community. The *mode* by which the distribution of income would be effected, would be varied from extreme complexity to simplicity, without disturbing the *comparative* position of the different classes of proprietors in respect of *income*, but not without *essential improvement and advantage to every description of proprietor*, including the public annuitant.

---

[1] Principles of Political Economy, ch. vii. sec. 9.

[2] pp. 59. 60.

The public creditor, who now requires and receives an income, through the medium of duties, is a party to a system which without the ambitious reach, or malign disposition, *or even the intention*, has the *effect* of the most subtle and severe tyranny. The claim of the public creditor can only be satisfied, under the present system, *by means of the successful exertion of the industry of the country*. The levy of money for the satisfaction of the public creditor, *through the medium of duties*, by rendering increased money prices for the national productions necessary, *opposes the interchange of property, by preventing production at low costs;* and the great amount, now required in respect of the public creditor, has the effect of oppressing with severe difficulty, nearly all who are engaged in the business of agriculture, and materially affects the manufacturer. Can a class of persons, *deriving an income through such means*, in any point of view *be necessary?* Can it be deemed *reasonable* or *right*, that the hand of industry should be paralysed by means of the very parties who demand, not only sustenance and support, but the maintenance of a princely bearing from that very hand?

The effect of the liquidation of the Public Debt, upon the plan which has been proposed, could not lower the power to consume in *any* individual now entitled to income in the way of a public annuity. Such persons are fairly and fully entitled to be maintained in the comparative situation, as to income, which they now occupy, and any proposition which might imply a deviation from that principle, ought at once to be rejected. The object proposed by the liquidation of the Public Debt is, not the relief of one class at the expense of another, but the *relief and improvement of the condition of all;* and that relief would be effected, in the first instance, by rendering *unnecessary* a considerable part of the amount now annually levied in respect of the Public Debt, and by levying the remainder directly upon property, either annually, or in a sum to be received in full and final satisfaction of the claim in respect of the debt, as might be best adapted to the situation and disposition of individual proprietors. By which means the great increase of money price now rendered necessary, in respect of all national productions and imported commodities, would no longer be required, excepting that some caution and guard, as already suggested, might be considered prudent to prevent any other than a somewhat gradual return to a standard of low money prices, in regard *to agricultural productions.*

The able author of the remarks upon the "Further Observations upon the practicability and expediency of liquidating the Public Debt, &c." in the MONTHLY EDINBURGH REVIEW, No. XVIII.[1] insists much upon the difficulty of carrying the proposed plan into effect.

Sensible of the state of the country, this writer appears justly to apprehend, that any considerable *additional impost,* in what form soever it might be attempted, could not be paid; and—denying that the proposer of the plan had succeeded in showing that extensive relief from duties, or from duties and taxes, would *precede* any actual levy in respect of the liquidation of the Public Debt—objects that the plan is impracticable because the contribution to be required *could not be paid.*

It is admitted to be essential to the practicability of the plan, that extensive relief from public burthens *should precede* any actual levy; and explanation is due, not only on account of the importance of this point in its bearing upon the question, but is also due to the respectable quarter in which the objection originates.

The dividends on stock are payable on the 5th of January, 5th of April, 5th of July, and 10th of October, and with the interest on the Unfunded Debt amount to 32 millions annually.

It will be supposed that the liquidation of the Public Debt, upon the outline of the plan which has been suggested, had been adopted as a legislative measure, to take effect from the 5th of January, 1822, and that the dividends payable on that day, had been provided from the ordinary sources of revenue.[2]

In this case, the demand for *future* dividends and interest on Unfunded Debt, would very little exceed twenty-seven millions, and the public would thenceforward be relieved from demand;

---

[1] Now published QUARTERLY, and designated the *New Edinburgh Review.*

[2] Written in 1821.

In respect of the public creditor, (his contribution of 15 per cent.)	£4,900,000
Sinking Fund,	5,000,000
15 per cent. upon public appointments, estimated—together with the decline in the price of stores for the public service, incident to the reduction of duties—at	4,000,000
Together	£13,900,000

The demand of fourteen millions nearly, for the annual public service, would *utterly cease* from the 5th of January, 1822, and consequently, *provided the Sinking Fund be efficient to the extent of five millions*, duties, or duties and taxes, to the extent of fourteen millions, nearly, would be remitted from the same date. If the Sinking Fund be not efficient to that extent, the remission of duties or duties and taxes, must be limited accordingly.

The duties or duties and taxes, to be thus remitted, whether extending to fourteen millions or limited to nine millions, or extending to some intermediate sum, would *clearly precede* all demand in respect of the liquidation of the Public Debt.

The demand, in respect of property, would be Three hundred and seventy-five millions, or, after the rate of Eighteen millions seven hundred and fifty thousand pounds per annum, at the option of the contributor.

To the further and great extent of this last mentioned sum, 18,750,000*l.* also, would duties or duties and taxes, in the case supposed, of the adoption of the plan for the liquidation of the Public Debt, be remitted, from the same 5th of January, and this *further* relief would consequently equally *precede* all demand in respect of the liquidation of the Debt. That sum would no longer be required by the onerous and destructive mode of levy by duties, and the remission of duties or duties and taxes, to the extent of these combined sums, *approaching to or exceeding thirty millions per annum*, combined with the assurance of further and final relief from the burthen of the Public Debt, could not fail to give spirit and vigor and *power* to the country, and would well prepare, dispose and *enable* it to bear the demand of the contribution to be required in respect of property.

Contributors in respect of *property*, would divide themselves into two classes—

Contributors who would pay the principal sum required of them.[1]

---

[1] This class could not fail to be very extensive; all persons possessing Government Stock *and also other* property, would *cancel stock* in the proportion necessary to the relief of that *other* property from the assessment there-

Contributors who would elect to pay the interest of 5 per cent., upon the sums assessed upon them, respectively in lieu of paying the principal sum.

In respect of the first class, the relief of the country would be full, final and effectual; an equal amount of stock would by means of such contribution be extinguished, and no provision for the payment of future dividends on such stock, would be required.

Contributors who should elect to pay interest in lieu of paying the principal sum assessed, give occasion to some care and arrangement, but do not present any difficulty.

They allow the proportion of the Public Debt or Stock to be liquidated by them, to remain undischarged, and a sum equal to the dividend upon such stock must therefore be provided; the duties which were imposed for that purpose are remitted to the country, and to enable the Government to pay such dividends recourse must be had to the interest to be paid by them. The position does not involve any difficulty: before the first half-yearly payment of interest could become due, the contributors would have found more than commensurate relief in the general remission of duties and the improved state of the country; and if, as must be supposed, the collection could not be made *in sufficient time* for the payment of the half-yearly dividends, an issue of Exchequer Bills in anticipation of such receipt, would enable the Government to act temperately, considerately and feelingly, in the collection of the contribution, and under the circumstances supposed, would not be unwelcome to the monied part of the community. The *relief* would, as matter of course, *precede* the *demand*, and *in addition*, any reasonable extension of time for the payment of the contributions might with facility be accorded, where required.

It is also objected by the same REVIEWER, notwithstanding the particular explanation of the AUTHOR upon that part of the subject, that great inconvenience would arise from the liquidation

---

on. A landholder having one million value in land, would, in such respect, be assessed 150,000*l.* Having also 300,000*l.* 5 per cent. stock, the *Government* would *cancel* 45,000*l. stock*, in respect of the *assessment on stock*, and *he would himself* (in preference to paying 5 per cent. per annum on the assessment of 150,000*l.*) *cancel* 150,000*l. more of the stock;*—by which means he would, in great measure, effect the deliverance of his land from the destructive effect of the present system of finance, reserving his right to 105,000*l.* stock, the amount of which he would receive in the progress of the liquidation of the public debt.

of the Public Debt, to many descriptions of persons now entitled to an annuity from the public.

Some care and attention on the part of the annuitant would, of course, become necessary; because in lieu of an annuity derived from the whole of the labor and exertion of the country and guaranteed by the State, he would find it necessary to invest his capital in property, to be let to a tenant upon whom he would have to depend for rent, or he would himself employ the capital, or he would advance his capital on the security of a mortgage; or upon the supposition of a Bank of Deposit being established, he would advance it on loan to such Bank; in either of which cases his situation would assimilate to his present situation, but with this material difference—that he would *lend,* not *sink* his capital. The money which he would advance to the Bank of Deposit, the Bank would again *lend,* and the borrower, having the use of the capital, would be justly called upon to pay the interest. The *original lender* would be secure under the engagement of the Bank, and the *borrower* would enjoy the use of the money. The contract would be of advantage to all the parties concerned in it; and *no* disadvantage to the public, in respect of the money price of commodities, or in any other respect, could be justly apprehended. As the liquidation of the Public Debt would not create, or in any manner add to, capital, but would powerfully tend to create demand for it, it does not appear reasonable to doubt that security for such capital as the proprietor might not himself choose to employ, would be presented in some one of the recognised forms of security, or that if a new mode or form of security should be required for the convenience of society, the resource and ingenuity of the country would be found equal to such purpose, without, as at present, bearing down and destroying the interests of the agricultural orders and lowering and distressing every other active and real interest of this great, and otherwise, most powerful community.

The Reviewer also repeats the objection previously urged by him, that a remainder of 350 millions of debt would continue after the proposed measure should have been carried into effect.

In repeating this objection the Reviewer appears not to regard the consideration urged by the Author, that in the event of the 3 per cent. and other lower annuities being paid off, not at the par of 100*l.*, but at a market rate of price, the sum of 350 millions, supposed to remain unliquidated, might be very sensibly reduced; that the whole of the property to be remitted to the United Kingdom from the British Dependencies, and all British property to be received from Foreign countries, would be the separate and additional subject of contribution; that an increase of revenue might be expected from the repression of illicit trade; and that the decreasing dividends on stock, with a revenue (after being reduced to a certain low standard) *not* decreasing, but probably greatly increasing with the increasing exertions of the country, would constitute an *effective* Sinking Fund for the final subjection and extinction of the Debt.

These considerations appear to the Author, to be quite sufficient to allay the apprehension of the continuance of any portion of the Public Debt, beyond a period of time such as may be considered rather in the nature of recommendation than objection to the Author's views, since, although *great immediate relief would be experienced,* the advantage of time would be obtained for the progressive completion of the measure.

APPENDIX E. (p. 14.)

THE *Eastern* Tropical dependencies are strongly distinguished from the *Western* Tropical dependencies of the Empire.

The cultivation of the *Western* dependencies is limited by the prevention of the further importation of laborers from the continent of Africa, and the laborers who are actually employed, are slaves of considerable price, and whose maintenance is very expensive.

The *Eastern* dependencies are cultivated, chiefly, by *native free subjects,* unlimited in number, of the most frugal habits, and who submit to labor at the lowest rate of compensation.

The excellence and great value of Tropical productions; the general demand for, and vast consumption of these productions, especially in Europe; the great extent, fertility and variety of the British Tropical *Eastern* dependencies; the ingenuity and industry of the inhabitants, *the remarkably cheap rate of labor,* the great *bulk* of their productions, and their *maritime distance,* concur to render the agriculture of the Asiatic dependencies of the British Empire, the subject of deep interest. It is, at the same time, unquestionable, that the *British West India planter* is entitled to the effective support and protection of the British Government.

He (the West India planter) has embarked great capital in situations peculiarly exposed to difficulty and hazard; his plantation or farm is a source of consumption, to great extent, of British produce and manufactures; the property created by his capital, industry and skill, is of great annual amount; his employment of British shipping is extensive; the business which he transacts with the British merchant very considerable;—he administers extensively to the comforts and satisfactions of life by the description of produce which he carries to market, and his income is, to great extent, expended within the British Isles. The plantations in the West have been the anxious object of conquest and legislation; the property which is embarked in these plantations may be considered to have been so embarked under the peculiar favor and encouragement of the State, and not only *property*, but the *condition of the numerous laborers employed therein*, depend upon the well-being of the planter.

But however forcible and even imperative the various considerations which entitle the British Western Tropical planter to effective support and protection, it may be difficult, if not *impracticable*, materially to extend the *Foreign* market for his productions, at the *rate of cost* at which they are *now* produced. Even the British markets require high additional duties upon sugar, and other Tropical productions of Foreign and of *British Asiatic* growth, to assure the preference to the British Western planter.

In the mean time, the cultivation of sugar and coffee in Louisiana, Cuba, the Brazils, and other Foreign Tropical countries, receives considerable impulse, excites a distressing energy in the Foreign trade in slaves, and invigorates the Foreign marine, particularly the marine of the United States of America.

The vast supplies of Tropical produce demanded by the Northern and Southern divisions of the globe (chiefly by the Northern) are derived either from the British dependencies in the West, the British dependencies in the East, or from Foreign territory in the West or East.

The opposing and rival interests which spring from these several sources, involve the *question of the Trade in Slaves*, and *eventually*, the question of the *Ascendancy of Nations*.

In this great contest, the conservation of the *Western* Tropical dependencies is the first object of solicitude. It is more important to *preserve*, than to *excite and create*.

The care of the Western Colonial interests is the natural duty of the several States, in connexion with the several colonies: not as an interest in common, but as the *separate* interest of each

State in respect of its own colony. The markets of the respective countries having colonies, is the only sure resource for the sale of their productions, and upon the consumption of such markets, the conservation of the Western colonies essentially depends.

Beyond this boundary, the more enlarged course of policy arising from the independence of the United States of America, the incipient independence of the Southern division of America, and the facilities of intercourse with the East, do not appear to admit of protection being extended to the Western colonies. Except the market of the parent State and its dependencies (if any) demanding Tropical supplies, the whole world is a market for the competition of the Eastern and Western planter; and in this contest it is evident, that *with the advantage of European instruction*, superadded to his other advantages, the Eastern planter must predominate.

The assurance of this result rests chiefly upon the low rate of Eastern labor, and which is not counterpoised by the greater maritime distance of India, from the great market of Europe. If a pound of cotton-wool cost 3*d*. or 4*d*. in India, in Carolina 8*d*. or 9*d*.; the addition of one penny per pound to the cost of the East India[1] cotton-wool, on account of the greater distance, will not prevent a decided preference for the Indian production. Upon this scale, or any approximation to it, the Western planter must yield the market to the productions of India, unless the superior *quality* of the Western production should compensate for the higher price.

The British Asiatic planter, who occupies the more fruitful, as well as the more extensive Tropical countries of the East, can only be considered to have been in European connexion in respect of *rice*, *cotton-wool* and *sugar*, since the reduction of the East India Company's chartered rights, in the year 1814. The previous heavy freight, charges and *delay*, held in severe check the importation of these productions. The progress which has been made since that period, in the introduction of these commodities into the market of Europe, already presses with great effect, and plainly indicates the further consequences of this distressing competition to the Western planter, if not adequately protected by the parent State.

The Spanish Western colonies and the Brazils, have not the advantage of adequate markets for the sale of their produce in the European States with which they are, respectively, immediately connected; and the Southern members of the *United States of*

---

[1] Supposing a halfpenny per pound freight from Carolina and 1½*d*. per pound from India.

America, notwithstanding the increasing population of these States, depend, for a market, chiefly upon Foreign countries; and are, consequently, exposed to the risk of severe check in their agriculture.

The French, Dutch, Danish and Swedish Western colonies, are, probably, sufficiently protected by the markets of their respective countries.

The *British* Western colonies have the advantage of the great market of the British Isles, and the market of the British Northern dependencies. These are close markets, nearly, for the chief productions of these colonies. In addition, the markets of the continent of Europe demand supplies of British Western colonial produce;[1] but those markets being freely supplied with Tropical productions, by connected colonies, by the Eastern British dependencies and by Foreign countries, reliance cannot safely be placed, by the British Western planter, upon the European continental markets. It is clear that the British West India planter can only *safely* and *assuredly* calculate upon the markets of the British Isles and of the British North American dependencies. The British Government commands no other markets, and by an act of power only can the Western planter be protected even in those markets. Upon a principle of broad and open competition his great and valuable interests must give way to less expensive systems of management.

Having then these advantages, if the market of consumption do not accord an adequate price to the British Western planter, it is evident either that the production exceeds the demand, *or* that the *costs* of production, as in the instance of British corn, are too heavy to be recovered at market.

Without attempting any nice definition in this respect, it is clear that the reduction of the revenue system of the United Kingdom is an object anxiously to be desired by the West India planter. Upon the substitution of a low for a high revenue system he depends;—

For the extension of market by the increase *and improved condition of the people of the United Kingdom.*

For the extension of market *by lowering the duties on his productions.*

For the reduction of the cost of the extensive supplies for which he is compelled to resort to the United Kingdom.

For the reduction of the costs of Navigation, and other charges of transit.

With these powerful assistances, the British Western Tropical dependencies, notwithstanding the superior comparative means of the Eastern planter, would promise to be a continued source of individual prosperity and of national power. *Without* such assistances, the depression of the British *Western* Tropical agriculture must be expected to add to and to aggravate the national distress resulting from the state of the agriculture of the British Isles.

---

[1] Chiefly sugar refined in Great Britain.

The British *Western* Tropical dependencies being however supposed to be thus relieved, and their interests secured by the only means which appear calculated to relieve and secure them, namely,

By the extension or increase of British consumption and the reduction of charge and expense, by means of the *reduction of the British revenue system, or the liquidation of the Public Debt of the United Kingdom,* and by the special protection of the State; the agriculture of the British *Eastern* dependencies, becomes a distinct and unembarrassed consideration, and unquestionably presents an object fraught with the most important bearings and consequences.

The ascendancy of Great Britain depends upon her *Marine,* and her *Marine* depends upon the *bulk* of the commodities of which she is the carrier, and the *distance* to or from which such commodities be carried, combining the consideration of the nature of the climate which she may visit.

The Eastern parts of Asia are highly fruitful in most of the *bulky,* as well as the more refined productions, which Europe demands from Tropical countries; and those parts of Asia are not only the *most distant of the Tropical countries,* but are, to vast extent, a portion of the British Empire. The bulky Tropical productions are demanded in quantities so considerable, as to render their carriage a chief source of maritime power; and although Tropical climates, generally speaking, are not favorable to the health of strangers, the effect of a change of climate upon the European constitution, has been mitigated by care and professional skill, and seamen seasoned to such climates by the intercourse of trade, are the best calculated to defend their country, in the same climates, in the day of trial.

The chief bulky Tropical productions are saltpetre, pepper, rice, indigo, cotton-wool, sugar, coffee and tobacco. These commodities, if wholly derived from the *Western* division of the globe, would keep in constant employ sufficient shipping and seamen to render the nation, which should convey to market a large proportion of the whole, a *great* maritime power. The same commodities, if derived wholly from the *Eastern* division of the globe, would keep in as constant employ an increase of shipping and seamen, extending to double, or nearly double, the quantity and number;

and *in this view*, the advantage of the employment is commensurate with the increase of distance.

Are then Foreign nations to be supplied with these Tropical Productions from the Western or from the Eastern divisions of the globe?

Are they to be supplied through the medium of the British or Foreign flag?

Are they to be supplied by means of the labor of slaves employed on the soil of other countries, or by means of the labor of native, free, British subjects, employed on British territory?

Two things being premised, the conclusion is direct and unavoidable.

Provided the British Western interests be fully protected, and provided these commodities can be delivered at market of *equal quality* and at *equal price*, the duty and the policy of Great Britain cannot be mistaken. By supplying and conveying Tropical productions from her own dominions in the East, she obtains for her own subject, the preference of employment in the production of the commodity required; she *prevents* a Foreign *demand* for *slave labor*, and she displaces *one Foreign* ship by the substitution of *two British* ships. *Two* cargoes of cotton or other produce may be conveyed to Europe from the *West*, in the time which would be required to convey one such cargo from the *East*.

It has already been endeavoured to be shown, that the British Western interests admit of full and complete protection, consistently with the extension of the demand upon Asia for Tropical supplies;—the questions of quality and price only, therefore, remain be noticed.

Saltpetre, pepper, indigo, rice, cotton-wool, sugar, coffee and tobacco, are the chief of the *bulky* Tropical productions.

Saltpetre and *pepper* are not the subject of competition between the West and the East, the first being entirely, and the second almost exclusively, derived from the East. *Indigo*, which was formerly derived, with trifling exception, from *Foreign Colonies* in the West, has been cultivated under the fostering hand of the East India Company, and more recently by individual enterprise, with great success in the British dominions in India, and the Foreign indigo of the West, is, in consequence, nearly supplanted by the British indigo of the East. The *rice* of the East is incomparably superior in *quality* to the rice of the West (Carolina); the *condition* in which the East India rice is brought to market checks its consumption, but notwithstanding this great impediment to its introduction into general use, the consumption of East India rice in England, on the continent of Europe, and in the West Indies, renders it a considerable object of commerce, and the better quality (more nutritious) and lower price, assisted by the improving condition in which it is brought to market, cannot fail to obtain for it, gradually, a decided preference over the rice of the West. The *cotton-wool* of India, which when burdened with high freight and charges, was not an object of attention to the merchant or manufacturer, is now an object of the first importance in the trade and manufactures of the country. The consumption in England and on the continent of Europe is *very considerable*, and it is, *therefore*, a production of great importance; but the *effect* of the large importations and extensive use of the East India cotton-wool, and of the low rate of price at which it is imported, upon the price of *Foreign* cotton-wool, is a more weighty and important consideration. To these causes must be ascribed a large proportion of the considerable reduction in the price of cotton manufactures, and to the *low price* at which these manufactures can be afforded at market, must be ascribed, in great part, the *extended* and *increasing* demand for such manufactures. The *low price* of the East India cotton-wool, *is a consideration of great moment to Great Britain*, and the consumption, if not bounded by the low price which the Foreign cotton planter is *compelled* to accept for his produce, in consequence of the price of East India cotton-wool, and the want of attention in India to the *condition* in which the East India cotton-wool is sent to market, must necessarily increase. The *sugar* of India is become the subject of extensive consumption on the continent of Europe, and notwithstanding the higher duty which is imposed upon it, is the subject of consumption even in England, to an extent plainly indicating that the demand would be considerable, if admitted upon equal terms with British West India sugar. The coffee of India—(the produce chiefly of the Dutch settlement in Java) is also a very extensive subject of trade with Europe, and excepting tobacco, the *bulky* Tropical productions of the East, appear to be forcing their way, in all kinds, into the markets of Europe, by means of the *low price* at which they can be afforded. Tobacco is produced in India, very generally, for native consumption, but whether that production will be added to the evidence of the resources of India for the supply of the European market, can only be determined by more experience: that its introduction will be attempted, under the better commercial principles now in operation, or expected to be brought into operation, cannot admit of doubt; and the same advantage of cheap labor may be expected to produce results similar to those which are actually experienced in indigo, rice, cotton-wool and other productions.

The British Eastern dominions, although not the *exclusive*, are the principal source or medium of these supplies, and whether the resources of these dominions be contemplated in reference to the cheap and abundant supply to the manufacturer of the unwrought material, the permanent and steady demand for British artificery and manufactures, the repression of the Foreign employment of slaves, the improvement of the condition of the Asiatic subject, the general increase of civilisation, or the increase of the British marine, separately, or be contemplated in a connected and combined view of these important considerations, British India is a subject of deep and impressive interest to the Merchant and Manufacturer, the Philanthropist, the Philosopher and the Statesman.

A HISTORY OF THE PENAL LAWS AGAINST THE IRISH CATHOLICS;

FROM THE TREATY OF LIMERICK TO THE UNION.

WITH AN INDEX.

BY SIR HENRY PARNELL, BART. M. P.

NEW EDITION, CORRECTED FOR THE PAMPHLETEER EXCLUSIVELY.

LONDON:
1822.

A
HISTORY
OF THE
PENAL LAWS,
&c. &c.

WILLIAM III.

When James II. abdicated the throne of England, he retired to France, to solicit the aid of Louis XIV. to enable him to secure the possession of Ireland, where he was still acknowledged as the lawful sovereign. On the 12th of March, 1689, James landed at Kinsale with about 1200 of his own subjects in the pay of France, and 190 French officers. He was received with open arms, and the whole country seemed to be devoted to him, for although the Protestants in the north had declared for the new government, their strength and number were inconsiderable, when compared with the forces of the Lord Deputy Tyrconnel. This minister had disarmed all the other Protestants in one day, and assembled an army of 30,000 foot, 8,000 cavalry.[1] Addresses were poured in upon James from all orders of the people. The established clergy among the rest, congratulated him upon his arrival, a certain sign that his chance of success was not contemptible.

James continued to govern Ireland, without any interruption from William, till the 13th of August,[2] when Schomberg landed at Belfast with an English army of 10,000 men. To oppose him, James collected his forces, amounting to 30,000, at Drogheda.[3] Schomberg who had arrived at Dundalk, thought it prudent to advance no farther; and instead of reducing Ireland, after having lost one half of his army by sickness, he at the end of the campaign was under the necessity of entrenching himself against an enemy, which he had been taught in England to despise, and of confining his operations to the protection of the northern province.[1]

---

[1] Smollett, I. 36. [2] Leland, v. 3, b. 6. c. 6. [3] Ib.

On the 14th of June in the year following, William landed with reinforcements at Carrickfergus. The distracted state of England, and the formidable preparations of France, inclined him to a vigorous prosecution of the war in Ireland.[2] He advanced towards Dublin with an army of 36,000 men. James collected his forces amounting to 33,000 at Drogheda, and by an unaccountable infatuation resisted the advice of his general officers, to act on the defensive against William; who would then have had to contend, at the same time, against a threatened foreign invasion of Britain, the insurrection which his own subjects were plotting, and the difficulty of maintaining his Irish army in an unfriendly climate, without provisions or succours.

Though William obtained a decided victory at the Boyne, the Irish army had fought with courage and obstinacy; and, in consequence of having at one time repulsed the centre of the English army, were able to retire in good order, with the loss of only 1500 men.[3] The subsequent defeat of General Douglas before Athlone, and of William himself before Limerick, left James, at the end of the campaign, in possession of nearly one half of Ireland, and well supported by an army inured to war, and commanded by able and experienced generals. William experienced still greater embarrassments on the continent and in England. A victory had been gained by Luxemburgh, in Flanders, over Prince Waldeck and the confederate army; Tourville had defeated the united fleets of England and Holland; and great dejection and discontent were visible among his British subjects.

William having returned to England in the autumn of 1690, General Ginckle, with an army inferior to that of St. Ruth, who now commanded the Irish forces, commenced the campaign by the capture of the fort of Baltimore. Having afterwards taken Athlone, and defeated St. Ruth at the battle of Aughrim, he laid siege to Limerick on the 25th of August, 1691. The fortifications had been strengthened since William was repulsed before it in the preceding year; the garrison was healthy, well supplied, and in numbers equal to the assailants, and strong succours were daily expected from France.[4] The besiegers, on the other hand, were too few for the undertaking, the season of the year was far advanced, and they had no expectations of receiving any reinforcements.

Week passed away after week without Ginckle's obtaining any advantage over the besieged; at length he made a lodgment on the West side of the Shannon. But, notwithstanding this success, it was debated whether the siege should be carried on, or converted into a blockade; such were the difficulties foreseen in reducing the town. It was dangerous for the besiegers to continue in their present station on the approach of winter, and hazardous to divide an army sufficient only for assailing the town on one side; and yet the only effectual way of reducing it was to invest it on all sides, by cutting off the garrison from all intercourse with the county of Clare.[1]

---

[1] Leland, v. 3, b. 6. c. 6. [2] Ib. [3] Ib. [4] Ib.

William, in the mean time, was so sensible of the necessity of obtaining the surrender of the Irish army, in order to secure his newly acquired throne, and the success of the revolution, that he sent instructions to the Lords Justices to issue a proclamation, offering to the Catholics still more liberal terms than those which they afterwards accepted; and he gave Ginckle urgent directions to terminate the war on any conditions.[2] Fortunately, however, for William and the revolution party, but most unfortunately, as events have since proved, for the Catholics, the garrison of Limerick beat a parley on the 29th day of the siege. A cessation of three days was granted; and, on the last day of it, the Irish generals proposed terms of capitulation. They required an act of indemnity for all past offences, with a full enjoyment of the estates they possessed before the present revolution, freedom for the Catholic worship, with an establishment of one Romish ecclesiastic in each parish. They also required, that Catholics should be declared fully qualified for every office, civil and military; that they should be admitted into all corporations; and, that the Irish army should be kept up and paid in the same manner with the king's other troops, provided they were willing to serve.[3] Ginckle refused to accede to their proposal; but being desired to offer such terms as he could grant, he proposed conditions which were accepted by the garrison, and which are contained in the following civil and military articles.

Three days after they were signed, the French fleet arrived in Dingle Bay.[4]

---

[1] Leland, v. 3. b. 6. c. 6.

[2] Ib. and Harris's Life of William, p. 372.
This was called the secret proclamation, because, though printed, it never was published, in consequence of the Lords Justices being informed of the inclination of the garrison to treat for their surrender.

[3] Leland, v. 3. b. 6. c. 6. [4] See Note A.

THE CIVIL AND MILITARY ARTICLES OF LIMERICK,

Exactly printed from the Letters Patent, wherein they are ratified and exemplified by their Majesties, under the Great Seal of England.[1]

Gulielmus et Maria Dei gratia, Anglæ, Scotiæ, Franciæ et Hiberniæ, rex et regina, fidei defensores, &c. Omnibus ad quos presentes literæ nostræ pervenerint salutem: inspeximus irrotulament. quarund. literarum patentium de confirmatione, geren. dat. apud Westmonasterium vicemo quarto die Februarii, ultimi præteriti in cancellar. nostr. irrotulat. ac ibidem de recordo remanem. in hæc verba. William and Mary, by the grace of God, &c. To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting. Whereas certain articles, bearing date the third day of October last past, made and agreed on between our justices of our kingdom of Ireland, and our general of our forces there on the one part; and several officers there, commanding within the city of Limerick, in our said kingdom, on the other part. Whereby our said justices and general did undertake that we should ratify those articles, within the space of eight months or sooner; and use their utmost endeavours that the same should be ratified and confirmed in parliament. The tenor of which said articles is as follows, viz.

ARTICLES AGREED UPON THE THIRD DAY OF OCTOBER, ONE THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED AND NINETY-ONE.

Between the Right Honorable Sir Charles Porter, Knight, and Thomas Coningsby, Esq. Lords Justices of Ireland; and his Excellency the Baron De Ginckle, Lieutenant General and Commander in Chief of the English army; on the one part.

And the Right Honorable Patrick Earl of Lucan, Piercy, Viscount Gallmoy, Colonel Nicholas Purcel, Colonel Nicholas Dusack, Sir Toby Butler, Colonel Garret Dillon, and Colonel John Brown; on the other part:

In the behalf of the *Irish Inhabitants in the City and County of Limerick, the Counties of Clare, Kerry, Cork, Sligo, and Mayo.*

In consideration of the Surrender of the City of Limerick, and other agreements made between the said Lieutenant General Ginckle, the Governor of the City of Limerick, and the Generals of the Irish army, bearing date with these Presents, for the

---

[1] The date of the ratification of these articles, is 5th of April, 1692, that is four years after their Majesties had taken the coronation oath.

Surrender of the City, and Submission of the said Army: it is agreed, That,

I. The Roman Catholics of this kingdom shall enjoy such privileges in the exercise of their religion, as are consistent with the laws of Ireland; or as they did enjoy in the reign of King Charles the Second; and their Majesties, as soon as their affairs will permit them to summon a Parliament in this kingdom, will endeavour to procure the said Roman Catholics such further security in that particular, *as may preserve them from any disturbance upon the account of their said religion.*

II. All the inhabitants or residents of Limerick, or any other garrison now in the possession of the Irish, and all officers and soldiers, now in arms, under any commission of King James, or those authorised by him, to grant the same in the several counties of Limerick, Clare, Kerry, Cork, and Mayo, or any of them; and all the commissioned officers in their Majesties' quarters, that belong to the Irish regiments now in being, that are treated with, and who are not prisoners of war, or have taken protection, and who shall return and submit to their Majesties' obedience; and their and every of their heirs, shall hold, possess, and enjoy, all and every their estates of freehold and inheritance; and *all the rights, titles and interest, privileges and immunities, which they, and every or any of them held, enjoyed, or were rightfully and lawfully entitled to in the reign of King Charles II.* or at any time since, by the laws and statutes that were in force in the said reign of King Charles II. and shall be put in possession, by order of the government, of such of them as are in the King's hands, or the hands of his tenants, without being put to any suit or trouble therein; and all such estates shall be freed and discharged from all arrears of crown rents, quit rents, and other public charges, incurred and become due since Michaelmas 1688, to the day of the date hereof: and all persons comprehended in this article, shall have, hold, and enjoy all their goods and chattels, real and personal, to them, or any of them belonging, and remaining either in their own hands, or in the hands of any persons whatsoever, in trust for, or for the use of them, or any of them: and all, and every the said persons, of what profession, trade, or calling soever they be, shall and may use, exercise, and practise their several and respective professions, trades and callings, as freely as they did use, exercise, and enjoy the same in the reign of King Charles II. provided that nothing in this article contained, be construed to extend to, or restore any forfeiting person now out of the kingdom, except what are hereafter comprised; provided also, that no person whatsoever shall have or enjoy the benefit of this article, that shall neglect or refuse to take the oath of allegiance,[1] made by act of Parliament in England, in the first year of the reign of their present Majesties, when thereunto required.

III. All merchants, or reputed merchants of the city of Limerick, or of any other garrison now possessed by the Irish, or of any town or place in the counties of Clare or Kerry, who are absent beyond the seas, that have not bore arms since their Majesties' declaration in February, 1688, shall have the benefit of the second article, in the same manner as if they were present; provided such merchants, and reputed merchants, do repair into this kingdom within the space of eight months from the date hereof.

IV. The following officers, viz. Colonel Simon Lutterel, Captain Rowland White, Maurice Eustace of Yermanstown, Chieveas of Maystown, commonly called Mount-Leinster, now belonging to the regiments in the aforesaid garrisons and quarters of the Irish army, who were beyond the seas, and sent thither upon affairs of their respective regiments, or the army in general, shall have the benefit and advantage of the second article, provided they return hither within the space of eight months from the date of these presents, and submit to their Majesties' government, and take the above-mentioned oath.

V. That all and singular the said persons comprised in the second and third articles, shall have a general pardon of all attainders, outlawries, treasons, misprisions of treason, premunires, felonies, trespasses, and other crimes and misdemeanors, whatsoever, by them, or any of them, committed since the beginning of the reign of King James II. and if any of them are attainted by Parliament, the Lords Justices, and General, will use their best endeavours to get the same repealed by Parliament, and the outlawries to be reversed gratis, all but writing-clerks' fees.

VI. And whereas these present wars have drawn on great violences on both parts; and that if leave were given to the bringing all sorts of private actions, the animosities would probably continue that have been too long on foot, and the public disturbances last: for the quieting and settling therefore of this kingdom, and avoiding those inconveniences which would be the necessary consequence of the contrary, no person or persons whatsoever, comprised in the foregoing articles, shall be sued, molested, or impleaded at the suit of any party or parties whatsoever, for any trespasses by them committed, or for any arms, horses, money, goods, chattels, merchandizes, or provisions whatsoever, by them seized or taken during the time of the war. And no person or persons whatsoever, in the second or third articles comprised, shall be sued, impleaded, or made accountable for the rents or mean rates of any lands, tenements, or houses, by him or them received, or enjoyed in this kingdom, since the beginning of the present war, to the day of the date hereof, nor for any waste or trespass by him or them committed in any such lands, tenements, or houses: and it is also agreed, that this article shall be mutual and reciprocal on both sides.

---

[1] I *A. B.* do sincerely promise and swear, that I will be faithful, and bear true Allegiance to their Majesties King William and Queen Mary. So help me God.

VII. Every nobleman and gentleman comprised in the side second and third articles, shall have liberty to ride with a sword and case of pistols, if they think fit; and keep a gun in their houses, for the defence of the same, or for fowling.

VIII. The inhabitants and residents in the city of Limerick, and other garrisons, shall be permitted to remove their goods, chattels and provisions, out of the same, without being viewed and searched, or paying any manner of duties, and shall not be compelled to leave the houses or lodgings they now have, for the space of six weeks next ensuing the date hereof.

IX. The oath to be administered to such Roman Catholics as submit to their Majesties' Government, shall be the oath abovesaid, and no other.

X. No person or persons who shall at any time hereafter break these articles, or any of them, shall thereby make, or cause any other person or persons to forfeit or lose the benefit of the same.

XI. The Lords Justices and General do promise to use their utmost endeavours, that all the persons comprehended in the abovementioned articles, shall be protected and defended from all arrests and executions for debt or damage, for the space of eight months next ensuing the date hereof.

XII. Lastly, the Lords Justices and General do undertake, that their Majesties will ratify these articles within the space of eight months, or sooner, and use their utmost endeavours that the same shall be ratified and confirmed in Parliment.

XIII. And whereas Colonel John Brown stood indebted to several Protestants, by judgments of record, which appearing to the late Government, the Lord Tyrconnel, and Lord Lucan, took away the effects the said John Brown had to answer the said debts, and promised to clear the said John Brown of the said debts; which effects were taken for the public use of the Irish, and their army: for freeing the said Lord Lucan of his said engagement, past on their public account, for payment of the said Protestants, and for preventing the ruin of the said John Brown, and for satisfaction of his creditors, at the instance of the Lord Lucan, and the rest of the persons aforesaid, it is agreed, that the said Lords Justices, and the said Baron De Ginckle, shall intercede with the

King and Parliament, to have the estates secured to Roman Catholics, by articles and capitulation in this kingdom, charged with, and equally liable to, the payment of so much of the said debts as the said Lord Lucan, upon stating accounts with the said John Brown, shall certify under his hand, that the effects taken from the said Brown amount unto; which accompt is to be stated, and the balance certified by the said Lord Lucan, in one and twenty days after the date hereof:

For the true performance hereof, we have hereunto set our hands,

Present,
SCRAVENMORE.
H. MACCAY.
T. TALMASH.

CHAR. PORTER.
THOS. CONINGSBY.
BAR. DE GINCKLE.

And whereas the said city of Limerick hath been since, in pursuance of the said articles, surrendered unto us. Now know ye, that we having considered of the said articles, are graciously pleased hereby to declare, *that we do for us, our heirs, and successors, as far as in us lies, ratify and confirm the same, and every clause, matter, and thing therein contained.*—And as to such parts thereof for which an act of Parliament shall be found to be necessary, we shall recommend the same to be made good by Parliament, and shall give our royal assent to any bill or bills that shall be passed by our two Houses of Parliament to that purpose. And whereas it appears unto us, that it was agreed between the parties to the said articles, that after the words Limerick, Clare, Kerry, Cork, Mayo, or any of them, in the second of the said articles, the words following, viz. "And all such as are under their protection in the said counties," should be inserted, and be part of the said articles. Which words having been casually omitted by the writer, the omission was not discovered till after the said articles were signed, but was taken notice of before the second town was surrendered: and that our said justices and general, or one of them, did promise that the said clause should be made good, it being within the intention of the capitulation, and inserted in the foul draft thereof. Our further will and pleasure is, and we do hereby ratify and confirm the said omitted words, viz. "And all such as are under their protection in the said counties," hereby for us, our heirs and successors, ordaining and declaring, that all and every person and persons therein concerned, shall and may have, receive, and enjoy the benefit thereof, in such and the same manner, as if the said words had been inserted in their proper place, in the said second article; any omission, defect, or mistake in the said second article in any wise notwithstanding. Provided always, and our will and pleasure is, that these our letters patents shall be enrolled in our court of Chancery, in our said kingdom of Ireland, within the space of one year next ensuing. In witness, &c. witness ourself at Westminster, the twenty-fourth day of February, anno regni regis & reginæ Gulielmi & Mariæ quarto per breve de privato sigillo. Nos autem tenorem premissor. predict. Ad requisitionem attornat. general. domini regis & dominæ reginæ pro regno Hiberniæ. Duximus exemplificand. per presentes. In cujus rei testimonium has litteras nostras fieri fecimus patentes. Testibus nobis ipsis apud Westmon. quinto die Aprilis, annoq. regni eorum quarto.

BRIDGES.

Examinat. per nos { S. KECK. LACON WM. CHILDE. } In Cancel. Magistros.

Military Articles agreed upon between the Baron de Ginckle, Lieutenant-General and Commander in Chief of the English army, on the one side—

And the Lieutenant-Generals De Ussoon and De Tesse, Commanders in Chief of the Irish army, on the other; and the General Officers hereunto subscribing.

I. That all persons, without any exceptions, of what quality or condition soever, that are willing to leave the kingdom of Ireland, shall have free liberty to go to any country beyond the seas (England and Scotland excepted) where they think fit, with their families, household-stuff, plate, and jewels.

II. That all general officers, colonels, and generally all other officers of horse, dragoons, and foot guards, troopers, dragooners, soldiers of all kinds, that are in any garrison, place, or post, now in the hands of the Irish, or encamped in the counties of Cork, Clare, and Kerry, as also those called Rapparees, or volunteers, that are willing to go beyond seas as aforesaid, shall have free leave to embark themselves wherever the ships are that are appointed to transport them, and to come in whole bodies as they are now composed, or in parties, companies, or otherwise, without having any impediment, directly or indirectly.

III. That all persons above-mentioned, that are willing to leave Ireland and go into France, shall have leave to declare it at the times and places hereafter mentioned, viz. the troops in Limerick, on Tuesday next in Limerick; the horse at their camp on Wednesday, and the other forces that are dispersed in the counties of Clare, Kerry, and Cork, on the 8th instant, and none other, before Monsieur Tameron, the French intendant, and Colonel Withers;

and after such declaration is made, the troops that will go into France must remain under the command and discipline of their officers that are to conduct them thither; and deserters of each side shall be given up, and punished accordingly.

IV. That all English and Scotch officers that serve now in Ireland, shall be included in this capitulation, as well for the security of their estates and goods in England, Scotland, and Ireland, (if they are willing to remain here,) as for passing freely into France, or any other country, to serve.

V. That all the general French officers, the intendant, the engineers, the commissaries at war, and of the artillery, the treasurer, and other French officers, strangers, and all others whatsoever, that are in Sligo, Ross, Clare, or in the army, or that do trade or commerce, or are otherways employed in any kind of station or condition, shall have free leave to pass into France, or any other country, and shall have leave to ship themselves, with all their horses, equipage, plate, papers, and all their effects whatever; and that General Ginckle will order passports for them, convoys, and carriages, by land and water, to carry them safe from Limerick to the ships where they shall be embarked, without paying any thing for the said carriages, or to those that are employed therein, with their horses, cars, boats, and shallops.

VI. That if any of the aforesaid equipages, merchandise, horses, money, plate, or other moveables, or household-stuff belonging to the said Irish troops, or to the French officers, or other particular persons whatsoever, be robbed, destroyed, or taken away by the troops of the said General, the said General will order it to be restored, or payment to be made according to the value that is given in upon oath by the person so robbed or plundered: and the said Irish troops to be transported as aforesaid: and all other persons belonging to them, are to observe good order in their march and quarters, and shall restore whatever they shall take from the country, or make restitution for the same.

VII. That to facilitate the transporting the said troops, the General will furnish fifty ships, each ship's burthen two hundred tons; for which the persons to be transported shall not be obliged to pay, and twenty more, if there shall be occasion, without their paying for them; and if any of the said ships shall be of lesser burthen, he will furnish more in number to countervail; and also give two men of war to embark the principal officers, and serve for a convoy to the vessels of burthen.

VIII. That a commissary shall be immediately sent to Cork to visit the transport ships, and what condition they are in for sailing: and that as soon as they are ready, the troops to be transported shall march with all convenient speed, the nearest way, in order to embark there: and if there shall be any more men to be transported than can be carried off in the said fifty ships, the rest shall quit the English town of Limerick, and march to such quarters as shall be appointed for them, convenient for their transportation, where they shall remain till the other twenty ships be ready, which are to be in a month; and may embark on any French ship that may come in the mean time.

IX. That the said ships shall be furnished with forage for horse, and all necessary provisions to subsist the officers, troops, dragoons, and soldiers, and all other persons that are shipped to be transported into France; which provisions shall be paid for as soon as all are disembarked at Brest or Nantz, upon the coast of Brittany, or any other port of France they can make.

X. And to secure the return of the said ships (the danger of the seas excepted) and payment for the said provisions, sufficient hostages shall be given.

XI. That the garrisons of Clare-castle, Ross, and all other foot that are in garrisons in the counties of Clare, Cork, and Kerry, shall have the advantage of this present capitulation; and such part of those garrisons as design to go beyond seas, shall march out with their arms, baggage, drums beating, ball in mouth, match lighted at both ends, and colors flying, with all the provisions, and half the ammunition that is in the said garrisons, and join the horse that march to be transported; or if then there is not shipping enough for the body of foot that is to be next transported after the horse, General Ginckle will order that they be furnished with carriages for that purpose, and what provisions they shall want in their march, they paying for the said provisions, or else that they may take it out of their own magazines.

XII. That all the troops of horse and dragoons that are in the counties of Cork, Kerry, and Clare, shall also have the benefit of this capitulation; and that such as will pass into France shall have quarters given them in the counties of Clare and Kerry, apart from the troops that are commanded by General Ginckle, until they can be shipped; and within their quarters they shall pay for every thing, except forage and pasture for their horses, which shall be furnished gratis.

XIII. Those of the garrison of Sligo that are joined to the Irish army, shall have the benefit of this capitulation; and orders shall be sent to them that are to convey them up, to bring them hither to Limerick the shortest way.

XIV. The Irish may have liberty to transport nine hundred horse, including horses for the officers, which shall be transported gratis; and as for the troopers that stay behind, they shall dispose of themselves as they shall think fit, giving up their horses and arms to such persons as the General shall appoint.

XV. It shall be permitted to those that are appointed to take care for the subsistence of the horse, that are willing to go into France, to buy hay and corn at the King's rates wherever they can find it, in the quarters that are assigned for them, without any let or molestation, and to carry all necessary provisions out of the city of Limerick; and for this purpose the General will furnish convenient carriages for them to the places where they shall be embarked.

XVI. It shall be lawful to make use of the hay preserved in the stores of the county of Kerry, for the horses that shall be embarked; and if there be not enough, it shall be lawful to buy hay and oats wherever it shall be found, at the King's rates.

XVII. That all prisoners of war that were in Ireland the 28th of September, shall be set at liberty on both sides; and the General promises to use his endeavours that those that are in England and Flanders shall be set at liberty also.

XVIII. The General will cause provisions and medicines to be furnished to the sick and wounded officers, troopers, dragoons, and soldiers of the Irish army, that cannot pass into France at the first embarkment; and after they are cured, will order them ships to pass into France, if they are willing to go.

XIX. That at the signing hereof the General will send a ship express to France; and that besides, he will furnish two small ships of those that are now in the river of Limerick, to transport two persons into France that are to be sent to give notice of this treaty; and that the commanders of the said ships shall have orders to put ashore at the next port of France where they shall make.

XX. That all those of the said troops, officers, and others, of what characters soever, that would pass into France, shall not be stopped on account of debt, or any other pretext.

XXI. If, after signing this present treaty, and before the arrival of the fleet, a French packet-boat, or other transport-ship, shall arrive from France in any other part of Ireland, the General will order a passport, not only for such as must go aboard the said ships, but to the ships, to come to the nearest port to the place where the troops to be transported shall be quartered.

XXII. That after the arrival of the said fleet, there shall be free communication and passage between it and the quarters of the above-said troops; and especially for all those that have passes from the chief commanders of the said fleet, or from Mons. Tameron, the Intendant.

XXIII. In consideration of the present capitulation, the two towns of Limerick shall be delivered and put into the hands of the General, or any other person he shall appoint, at the time and days hereafter specified, viz. the Irish town, except the magazines and hospital, on the day of the signing of these present articles; and as for the English town, it shall remain, together with the island, and the free passage of Thomond-bridge, in the hands of those of the Irish army that are now in the garrison, or that shall hereafter come from the counties of Cork, Clare, Kerry, Sligo, and other places above-mentioned, until there shall be convenience found for their transportation.

XXIV. And to prevent all disorders that may happen between the garrison that the General shall place in the Irish town, which shall be delivered to him, and the Irish troopers that shall remain in the English town and the island (which they may do, until the troops to be embarked on the first fifty ships shall be gone for France, and no longer), they shall entrench themselves on both sides, to hinder the communication of the said garrison: and it shall be prohibited on both sides, to offer any thing that is offensive; and the parties offending shall be punished on either side.

XXV. That it shall be lawful for the said garrison to march out all at once, or at different times, as they can be embarked, *with arms, baggage, drums beating, match lighted at both ends, bullet in mouth, colors flying, six brass guns, such as the besieged will chuse, two mortar pieces, and half the ammunition that is now in the magazines of the said place;* and for this purpose an inventory of all the ammunition in the garrison, shall be made in the presence of any person that the General shall appoint, the next day after these present articles shall be signed.

XXVI. All the magazines of provisions shall remain in the hands of those that are now employed to take care of the same, for the subsistence of those of the Irish army that will pass into France: and if there shall not be sufficient in the stores, for the support of the said troops whilst they stay in this kingdom, and are crossing the seas, that upon giving up an account of their numbers, the General will furnish them with sufficient provisions at the King's rates; and that there shall be a free market at Limerick, and other quarters where the said troops shall be; and in case any provision shall remain in the magazines of Limerick when the town shall be given up, it shall be valued, and the price deducted out of what is to be paid for the provisions to be furnished to the troops on ship-board.

XXVII. That there shall be a cessation of arms at land, as also at sea, with respect to the ships, whether English, Dutch, or French, designed for the transportation of the said troops, until they shall be returned to their respective harbours; and that on both sdesi they shall be furnished with sufficient passports both for ships and men: and if any sea commander, or captain of a ship, or any officer, trooper, dragoon, soldier, or any other person, shall act contrary to this cessation, the persons so acting shall be punished on either side, and satisfaction shall be made for the wrong that is done; and officers shall be sent to the mouth of the river of Limerick, to give notice to the commanders of the English and French fleets, of the present conjuncture, that they may observe the cessation of arms accordingly.

XXVIII. That for the security of the execution of this present capitulation, and of each article therein contained, the besieged shall give the following hostages—and the General shall give—

XXIX. If before this capitulation is fully executed, there happens any change in the government, or command of the army, which is now commanded by General Ginckle; all those that shall be appointed to command the same, shall be obliged to observe and execute what is specified in these articles, or cause it to be executed punctually, and shall not act contrary on any account.

Oct. 19. BARON DE GINCKLE.

If this treaty is only considered according to those rules of common morality, which influence the conduct of man to man; if, in proportion to the great advantages which England derived from it, she was bound to construe it with liberality, as well as to execute it with good faith; then the Irish Catholics must be considered as placed by it in a situation of complete equality with their Protestant countrymen. The free exercise of their religion was granted in the most unqualified manner: security of property was as fully confirmed to them. In regard to personal security, they were pardoned all misdemeanors whatsoever, of which they had been guilty, and were restored to all their rights, liberties, privileges, and immunities, which, by the laws of the land, and customs, constitutions, and native birth-right, they, any and every of them, were equally, with every other of their fellow subjects entitled to.[1] The practice of the several trades or professions was secured to them. They were allowed the use of arms, some of them specially, but all of them in consequence of no limitation or exception to the contrary; and they were left at liberty to vote for members of Parliament, and to sit in Parliament.[2] Even the laws which were in force against the Catholics, when the treaty took place, ought, according to the first article, to have been repealed;[1] because their Majesties engaged, by this article, to obtain for the Catholics such further security, in respect to the exercise of their religion, *as might preserve them from any disturbance on account of that religion.* It is impossible for any other fair construction to be given to this article, than that which is here given. It would be beneath the dignity, and wholly inconsistent with that character for good faith, of which it has always been the pride of England to boast, to attempt to apply any other meaning to it. No doubt there are those who would wish to act, on all occasions, towards the Catholics, according to that system of perverted morality which the powerful always impose on the weak: but, so long as the true principles of justice shall have their due influence, the majority of mankind can never consider this first article of the treaty of Limerick in any other light, than as a complete and perpetual exemption of the Irish Catholics from all political and religious disqualification on account of their religion. This treaty has been very accurately described as the great charter of the civil and religious liberty of the Catholics;[2] and though not hitherto observed as such by the English Government, the Catholics have a right (which time cannot efface, nor perfidy destroy) to recur to its stipulations.[3]

---

[1] Sir Theobald Butler's speech.

[2] The articles of Limerick were signed by De Ginckle on the 3d of Oct. 1691. The English Parliament that passed the 3d W. and M. c. 2. by which Irish peers and members of parliament were first required to take the oath of supremacy, met on the 22d Oct. 1691. According to the constitution of Ireland as granted by Henry II. and confirmed in 1782, this act of the 3d W. and M. c. 2. was not binding in Ireland, and though the Catholics submitted to it, they were not legally excluded from parliament till the 22d year of the reign of George the Third. This act was in direct violation of the treaty of Limerick.

Though William had bound himself by this treaty to call a Parliament as soon as his affairs would admit, and to obtain from it the ratification of it, he dissolved the first Parliament of his reign, which had met on the 5th of October, 1692, in Sept. 1693, without proposing to them any such measure. He was further guilty of a want of attention to his engagement, by not summoning another Parliament till the 27th April, 1695; and, when this Parliament did meet, he seems to have entirely forgotten that his own faith, and the faith of the English nation, was plighted to the Catholics by a solemn treaty; for, instead of recommending to them, in the speech of his Lord Deputy, to proceed to confirm the articles of Limerick, he told them that he was intent upon the great work of a firm settlement of Ireland upon a *Protestant* interest.[1] The Parliament were not backward in promoting his object. They first of all passed an act to deprive the Catholics of the means of educating their children either at home or abroad, and of the privilege of being guardians either of their own or of any other person's children.[2] Then they passed an act to disarm the Catholics,[3] another to banish their priests,[4] and, strange as it may appear, they then thought proper in the year 1697, to pass an act to *confirm the Articles* of Limerick.[5]

---

[1] These laws were, 1st, an act against the authority of the See of Rome. It enacts, that no person shall attribute any jurisdiction to the See of Rome; that the person offending shall be subject to a premunire; and, that all who have any office from the King, every person entering into orders, or taking a degree in the University, shall take the oath of supremacy.

2d. An act restoring to the Crown the ancient jurisdiction over the State, ecclesiastical and spiritual. It likewise enacts, that every ecclesiastical person, every person accepting office, shall take the oath of supremacy.

3d. An act for the uniformity of Common Prayer. It enacts, that every person, having no lawful excuse to be absent, shall, every Sunday, resort to some place of worship of the established Church, or forfeit 12d.

4th. An act by which the Chancellor may appoint a guardian to the child of a Catholic.

5th. An act by which no Catholic schoolmaster can teach in a private house, without a license from the ordinary of his diocese, and taking the oath of supremacy.

6th. The new rules, by which no person can be admitted into any corporation without taking the oath of supremacy.

This statement is taken from the Report of the Committee of the House of Commons, appointed in 1697, to consider what penal laws were then in force against the Catholics.—*Com. Jour. of Ireland*, v. 2.

[2] Smollet.

[3] The 9th Volume of Mr. Burke's works, which was published some time after this history of the Penal Laws, contains a complete justification of the view here taken of this treaty of Limerick. See p. 387.

Of this act it is to be observed, in the first place, that the very title of it is a proof of its injustice; for it is styled "an act for the confirmation *of articles*," and not, as it ought to be, "of *the* articles" made at the surrender of Limerick."

The preamble affords further evidence of the intention of the framers of it to evade its proper objects. It runs thus: "That the said articles, or *so much of them* as may consist with the safety and welfare of your Majesty's subjects of this kingdom, may be confirmed," &c.

But the whole act goes to convict the Parliament, and (as this Parliament was completely under the control of the Lord Deputy)[6] even William himself, of gross injustice towards the Catholics. For the first article of the treaty is wholly omitted, which guarantees to the Catholics the free exercise of their religion, and an exemption from all disturbance on account of it; and each clause of the act has the effect of limiting the terms of the other articles, and depriving the Catholics of the benefit of them, instead of ratifying and confirming them.

---

[1] Comm. Journal, 2. 279.

[2] 7th W. III. c. 4. Of this act Mr. Burke says, "Whilst this restraint upon foreign and domestic education was part of a horrible and impious system of servitude, the members were well fitted to the body. To render men patient, under a deprivation of all the rights of human nature, every thing which could give them a knowledge or feeling of those rights was rationally forbidden. To render humanity fit to be insulted, it was fit that it should be degraded. Indeed I have ever thought the prohibition of the means of improving our rational nature, to be the worst species of tyranny that the insolence and perverseness of mankind ever dared to exercise.—*Letter to a Peer of Ireland.*

[3] 7th W. III. c. 5. see §. 8. Catholic apprentices.

[4] 9th William III. c. 1.

[5] 9th William III. c. 2.

[6] "He (Lord Capel, the Lord Deputy) carried the projects of the Crown in Parliament, and was recommended as an excellent Governor, in a special address sent by the Commons to the King."—*Macpherson's Hist.* c. 2. 94.

The first clause, which refers at once to the second article, explains who are entitled to the benefit of it, and the rights conferred upon them; assuming as a fact, for which there could be no foundation, that this article required explanation. With respect to the persons entitled to the benefit of the treaty, a most remarkable difference occurs between the words of the second article, and those of this clause, in describing them. In the ratification of the treaty by William, there is the following passage: "and whereas it appears to us, that it was agreed between the parties to the said articles, that after the words Limerick, Clare, Kerry, Cork, and Mayo, or any of them, in the second of the said articles, the words following, viz. 'And all such as are under their protection in the said counties,' should be inserted and be part of the said article; Our further will and pleasure is, and we do ratify and confirm the said omitted words." These words, according even to the strict letter of the article, extended the benefit of the treaty to the whole Catholic population of these counties, which certainly was the object of the treaty, as it may be collected from the preamble to it, in which it is stated that the Irish Generals acted in behalf of the Irish inhabitants of these counties. But in this clause of the act of Parliament to *confirm* the treaty, these words are omitted, and therefore the benefit of the treaty is limited, by this explanatory and confining act, to the Irish army and the inhabitants of the city of Limerick, and a few more garrison towns: a limitation in every respect most perfidious, and wholly unjustifiable upon any plea of ambiguity in the language of the article, even if such a plea could for a moment be allowed.

With respect to the rights conferred by the second article, this clause affords a striking proof of the paltry subterfuges to which the legislature of that day could have recourse, in order to defeat the ends of justice, and to oppress the Catholics. The second article declares, that all those comprised in the treaty, "shall hold, possess, and enjoy, all and every their estates of freehold and inheritance; and all the rights, titles and interests, privileges and immunities, which they, every, or any of them held, enjoyed, or were rightfully and lawfully entitled to in the reign of King Charles II." The clause of the act corresponds with the article except in these most material points; after the word "inheritance" the stop, instead of being a semicolon, as it is in the original treaty, is altered to a comma; and after the words "privileges and immunities," the words "to the said estates" are inserted; and thus the meaning of the second article is wholly altered, and the words "rights, privileges, and immunities," made to refer to the estates of the Catholics, instead of to their persons and liberties, to which only, by the original article, they can refer. If any authority were wanting to maintain this construction, a very unquestionable one may be adduced from the speech of Sir Theobald Butler, before alluded to, who was in Limerick when it surrendered, and was the person employed to draw up the treaty.

This act for *confirming* the treaty, wholly omits that part of the second article which guarantees to the Catholics the exercise of their several trades and professions. It also omits the fourth article. It limits the benefit of the indemnity granted by the sixth article to a period subsequent to the 10th of April, 1689, and enables all persons, who suffered any injuries between the 5th of November, 1688, and this period, to bring their actions for the same until the first of September, 1691, by declaring that the commencement of the war referred to in the article, was the 10th of April, 1689, and not the 5th of November, 1688, and it omits the 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th articles. Being in short an act that, under the name of conferring favors upon the Catholics, really placed them in a worse condition than that in which they were before it passed into a law.

The other acts of this reign, relating to the Catholics, are, an act to prevent Protestants from intermarrying with Papists,[1] and an act to prevent them from being solicitors.[2] A clause was introduced in an act for the preservation of game, prohibiting papists from being employed as game-keepers.[3]

How it is possible to defend William and his ministers from the charge of having acted with perfidy towards the Catholics, it is not easy to discover. That they were guilty of violating the treaty no one can deny. The excuse that has been made for William, that he was obliged to submit to the power of the anti-catholic party, is not sufficient. Why did he not refuse his consent to these laws, on the ground of their being contrary to his solemn engagements to the Catholics? He had exercised this prerogative in the case of one Scotch,[4] and of one English bill.[5] But even this extremity might have been avoided, because the law of Poynings required, that every bill should be approved by the King and Council of England, before it could pass the House of Commons; and if a bill was exceptionable, by withholding their approbation, a very common proceeding, it fell of course to the ground.

---

[1] 9th William III. c. 3.

[2] 10th William III. c. 13.

[3] 10th William III. c. 8:

[4] For excluding from any public trust all such as had been concerned in encroachments of the late reign.

[5] Concerning free and impartial proceedings in Parliament.

But if William and his ministers were guilty of perfidy towards the Catholics, his successor far outstripped him. Nor has any succeeding prince been free from the blame of having been an accessary to his crime, in proportion as he has neglected or refused to repeal those penal laws, which are so many glaring violations of the treaty of Limerick, which are a scandal to the boasted good faith of the English nation, and a mockery of that equitable religion, whose precepts are founded upon the purest principles of justice and humanity.

ANNE.

On the 4th of March, 1704, the royal assent was given to the *act to prevent the further growth of popery;* being the first of those two famous acts, which have most deservedly been termed by Mr. Burke, the ferocious acts of Anne.

By the third clause of this act the popish father, though he may have acquired his estate by descent from a long line of ancestors, or by his own purchase, is deprived of the power, in case his eldest son, or any other son, becomes a Protestant, to sell, mortgage, or otherwise dispose of it, or to leave out of it any portions or legacies.

By the 4th clause, the popish father is debarred, under a penalty of 500*l.* from being a guardian to, or from having the custody of, his own children; but if the child, though ever so young, pretends to be a Protestant, it is to be taken from its own father, and put into the hands of a Protestant relation.

The 5th clause provides that no Protestant shall marry a Papist, having an estate in Ireland, either in or out of the kingdom.

The 6th clause renders Papists incapable of purchasing any manors, tenements, hereditaments, or any rents or profits arising out of the same, or of holding any lease of lives, or other lease whatever, for any term exceeding 31 years. Even with respect to this advantage restrictions are imposed on them, one of which is, that if a farm produced a profit greater than one-third of the amount of the rent, the right in it was immediately to cease, and to pass over entirely to the first Protestant who should discover the rate of profit.

The 7th clause deprives Papists of such inheritance, devise, gift, remainder or trust, of any lands, tenements, or hereditaments, of which any Protestant was, or should be seized in fee simple, absolute or fee tail, which, by the death of such Protestant, or his wife, ought to have descended to his son or other issue in tail, being Papists, and makes them descend to the nearest Protestant relation, as if the Popish heir and other Popish relations were dead.

By the 10th clause, the estate of a Papist, for want of a Protestant heir, is to be divided, share and share alike, among all his sons; for want of sons among his daughters, and for want of daughters among the collateral kindred of the father.

By the 15th clause, no person shall be exempt from the penalties of this act, that shall not take and subscribe the oath and declaration required by this act to be taken.

By the 16th clause, all persons whatsoever, who shall receive any office, civil and military, shall take and subscribe the oath and declaration required to be taken by the English act of 3d Wm. and Mary; and also the oath of abjuration required to be taken by another English act of 1st Anne; and also shall receive the sacrament.[1]

The 23d clause provides, that no Papist, except under particular conditions, shall dwell in Limerick or Galway.

The 24th, that no persons shall vote at elections without taking the oaths of allegiance and abjuration.

And the 25th clause, that all advowsons possessed by Papists shall be vested in her Majesty.

The Catholics, who had submitted in silence to all the unjust transgressions of the last reign, felt it necessary, when this act was first brought before Parliament, to use their utmost exertions to prevent it from passing into a law. They, however, appealed in vain to the English Cabinet to respect the solemn engagements of the treaty of Limerick, and were obliged to have recourse to a petition to the Irish Parliament.

Sir Theobald Butler was heard, as counsel for the petitioners, at the bar of the House of Commons, on the 22d February, 1703. He stated, "that the bill would render null and void the articles of Limerick; that those articles had been granted for the valuable consideration of the surrender of that garrison, at a time when the Catholics had the sword in their hand, and were in a condition to hold out much longer; and when they had it in their power to demand and make such terms as might be for their own future liberty, safety, and security: that the allowing of the terms contained in these articles were highly advantageous to the government to which they submitted, as well for uniting the people that were then divided, quieting and settling the distractions and disorders of this miserable kingdom, as for the other advantages which the government would thereby reap in its own affairs, both at home and abroad, when its enemies were so powerful, both by sea and land, as to render the peace and settlement of these countries a circumstance of great uncertainty: that these articles were ratified by their late Majesties, for themselves, their heirs, and successors; and the public faith thereby plighted to all those comprised in these articles, in the most binding manner it was possible for faith to be plighted, and than which nothing could be more sacred and solemn: that, therefore, to violate and break those articles would, on the contrary, be the greatest injustice possible for any one people of the whole world to inflict upon another, and contrary to both the laws of God and man." He then proceeded to show that the clauses of the bill which take away from Catholics the right to purchase, bequeath, sell, and inherit estates, were infringements of the 2d article of the treaty; that the 9th clause of the bill, imposing upon Catholics new oaths, was another manifest breach of the articles, for that, by the 9th article, no oath is to be administered to, nor imposed upon, such Catholics as should submit to government, but the oath of allegiance, appointed by an act made in England in the first year of the reign of their late Majesties; that the clauses for prohibiting Catholics from residing in Limerick or Galway, from voting at elections without taking certain new oaths, and from possessing advowsons, were likewise infringements of the treaty. "For if," concludes Sir Theobald Butler, "there was no law in force in the reign of Charles II. against these things, as there certainly was not, and if the Roman Catholics of this kingdom have not since forfeited their right to the laws that then were in force, as for certain they have not, then, with humble submission, all the aforesaid clauses, and matters contained in this bill, entitled, *An Act to prevent the further growth of Popery*, are directly against the plain words and true intent and meaning of the said articles, and a violation of the public faith."[1]

---

[1] Upon this clause of the bill Bishop Burnet makes the following observations: "A clause was added (in England) which they (the Roman Catholics) hoped would hinder its being accepted in Ireland: The matter was carried on so secretly, that it was known to none but those who were at the Council, till the news of it came to Ireland, upon its being sent thither. It was hoped, by those who got this clause added to the bill, that those in Ireland, who promoted it, would be less fond of it, when it had such a weight hung to it." *Hist.* v. 2. p. 214.

This clause has since been called the Sacramental Test, the first imposed on dissenters in Ireland. It was repealed without any opposition in the Sessions of 1782.

In consequence of the passing of this act, and of those other acts which were passed of a similar tendency in the reign of George the Second the Catholics were deprived of all those privileges and immunities, which they trusted had been secured in consequence of a

---

[1] Sir Theobald Butler's speech.

King of England having bound himself, his heirs and successors, to fulfil the conditions of the treaty of Limerick. In place of being the free subjects of a prince, from whom they were taught to expect only justice and mercy, they were made the slaves of every one, even of the very meanest, of their Protestant countrymen. They saw the English government, on whom they had claims for protection against their own parliament, directing its fanatic councils, and confirming its crimes. By the treaty of Limerick they were left at liberty to educate, and to act as guardians to their own children: by the penal laws they neither can send them to be educated abroad, or have them educated at home, or be guardians to their own, or the children of any other persons.

By the treaty of Limerick, the free exercise of their religion was guaranteed to them. By the penal laws their chapels are shut up, their priests are banished, and hanged if they returned home.

By the treaty of Limerick, their noblemen and gentlemen were specially allowed the privilege of wearing arms, and the whole body were equally entitled to the same privilege, because, when it was executed, no law existed to the contrary. By the penal laws, no Catholic is permitted to have the use of arms, except a very few even of those who were specially comprised in the treaty.

By the treaty of Limerick, Catholics might intermarry with Protestants. By the penal laws this privilege is removed.

By the treaty of Limerick, the profession of the law was open to them; by these laws it is taken from them.

By the treaty of Limerick, the Catholics could purchase, sell, bequeath, and inherit landed property. By the penal laws they can neither purchase, sell, bequeath, or inherit landed property, take annuities for lives secured on lands, or any longer lease of land than for 31 years; nor could they lend money on mortgage[1] or vest it in public securities.

By the treaty of Limerick, the Catholics were left in full enjoyment of every political franchise, except those of holding offices under government, and of becoming members of corporations. By the penal laws, they cannot vote at vestries, serve on grand juries, act as constables, or as sheriffs or under-sheriffs, be magistrates, vote at elections, or sit in Parliament.[2]

---

[1] By a construction of Lord Hardwicke.

[2] "The exclusion from the law, from grand juries, from sheriffships and under-sheriffships, as well as from freedom in any corporation, may subject them to dreadful hardships, as it may exclude them wholly from all that is beneficial, and expose them to all that is mischievous in a trial by jury. This was manifestly within my own observation, for I was three times in Ireland from the year 1760 to the year 1767, where I had sufficient means of information concerning the inhuman proceedings (among which were many cruel

By the treaty of Limerick, they were protected from being called upon to take any other oaths besides the oath of allegiance of the 1st William and Mary. By the penal laws they are required to take the oaths of abjuration and supremacy, and to subscribe declarations against the principal tenets of their religious faith.

By the treaty of Limerick, they were acknowledged as the free subjects of a British King; by the penal laws they are placed in the double capacity of slaves and enemies of their Protestant countrymen. Had they become mere slaves, they might have experienced some degree of humane treatment; but, as the policy which made them slaves, held them out at the same time as the natural and interested enemies of their masters, they were doomed to experience all the oppression of tyranny, without any of the chances, that other slaves enjoy, of their tyrants being merciful, from feeling their tyranny secure.

This statement will be sufficient to convince those who really form their political opinions upon principles of justice, that the penal laws never should have been enacted; and that it is the duty of every upright statesman to promote the instant repeal of the whole of them: because it proves a solemn compact entered into between the Catholics and the English Government, and the breach of that contract by the English Government, notwithstanding the Catholics fulfilled their part of the agreement. How can men gravely and zealously contribute to make perpetual the political disabilities of the Catholics, which were the base and perfidious means adopted by a wicked legislature to influence men's consciences by corrupt motives, and tempt and bribe them to apostacy?

As there are, however, no small number of politicians who, though they would think it an edifying exhibition to see a Catholic occasionally consigned to martyrdom, yet would be scandalised at the bare idea of breaking faith with him in any affair of barter, particularly if they had already received from him their consideration, and that a valuable one. It will be necessary to make some further observations upon the violation of the treaty of Limerick, in order that no one may have a pretext on which he can escape the fair conclusion that ought to be drawn from what has been advanced, that the English Government and Nation are, at this day, bound to make good to the Catholics of Ireland the stipulations contained in that treaty. For, if ever there was an instance in which the consideration that formed the basis of a treaty, should have secured a liberal and a just fulfilment, it was the instance of this treaty of Li-

murders, besides an infinity of outrages and oppressions, unknown before in a civilised age) which prevailed during that period, in consequence of a pretended conspiracy among Roman Catholics, against the King's Government." *Burke's Letter to a Peer of Ireland.*

merick. In the course of the three campaigns, during which the war lasted in Ireland, the English army had been defeated on several occasions. In the North under Schomberg; before Athlone under Douglas; and before Limerick under William himself. The victory of the Boyne was the result of the personal failings of James, not of any deficiency in the number of his army, or of any want of courage on their part. "Exchange Kings," said the Irish officers, "and we will once more fight the battle." St. Ruth had won the battle of Aughrim, and had exclaimed, in an ecstasy of joy, "Now will I drive the English to the walls of Dublin," at the moment the fatal ball struck him.[1] And, at the time the garrison of Limerick capitulated, the Irish army was in a condition to hold out at least another campaign, with a good prospect of being able to restore the fallen fortunes of James. The besieging army had made no impression on the principal part of the city; it was inferior in numbers to that of the garrison; winter was fast approaching, and at the very moment French succours were on the coast, yet all these advantages did the Irish army forego, in consideration of the terms which were granted to them by the treaty of Limerick. On the other hand, in granting these terms, the English Government and Nation obtained advantages of the utmost importance. For so long as James had a powerful army in Ireland, and nearly one half of the kingdom under his dominion, the great work of the revolution was neither accomplished nor secured. The fair way, therefore, of judging of the value of the treaty of Limerick to England, is to consider how far it contributed to promote this inestimable object. If the treaty of Limerick, in any degree, led to the establishment of the revolution, the vast importance of this event should incline the people of England to act with justice, at least, towards the Catholics. But if their submission contributed essentially to crown the brilliant efforts of the friends of liberty with success, then indeed the people of England should feel zealous to act towards the Catholics, not on a cold calculation of what was merely just on their part, but with that kindness with which we always regard those who have promoted our prosperity, whether intentionally or not. That the submission of the Irish Catholics did so contribute to complete the revolution is plain, from the means which they possessed of continuing the war; from the opportunity it afforded William to bring his whole forces to bear against Louis; and from the termination it fixed to the hopes and the conspiracies of the adherents of James in England. Yet, notwithstanding the great concessions which the Catholics, on their part, made by their submission, in order to obtain the terms of the

[1] Leland, B. 6, c. 7.

treaty of Limerick, and the great advantages which the English nation, on the other hand, acquired by it, twelve years only elapsed before the Catholics were deprived of every right and privilege which was solemnly guaranteed to them by that treaty.

The only species of justification that could, under any circumstances, have been brought forward for acting in this manner towards the Catholics, would have been, the proof of the forfeiture, by misconduct, of their right to the fulfilment of the treaty. That any thing which they did prior to the treaty, could have, in justice, any influence on measures passed subsequent to its taking place, is quite impossible; because the treaty admitted their acts to be those of open and honorable enemies, and specifically pardoned them.[1] As to their conduct afterwards, even their most inveterate and most unprincipled enemies did not charge them with a single transgression against the State, from the year 1691 to the year 1704, when the act to prevent the farther growth of Popery was passed. And it is very plain that no such charge could be maintained, from the paltry attempt that was made in Parliament to justify this act. It was said, "That the Papists had not demonstrated how and where, since the making of the articles of Limerick, they had addressed the Queen or Government, when all other subjects were so doing; and that any right, which they pretended was to be taken from them by the bill, was in their own power to remedy, by conforming, as in prudence they ought to do; and that they ought not to blame any but themselves."[2] No circumstance can possibly illustrate more clearly the innocence of the Catholics, and their loyalty and good conduct, from the treaty of Limerick to the passing of this act, than this mockery of justification; nor could any thing bring to our understandings an accurate comprehension of the perfidy and baseness of that Government, and of that Parliament more distinctly, than so silly an excuse for such stern and crafty oppression.

---

[1] "The peculiar situation of that country, (Ireland)" says Macpherson, "seems to have been overlooked in the contest. The desertion, upon which the deprivation of James had been founded in England, had not existed in Ireland. The Lord Lieutenant had retained his allegiance. The Government was uniformly continued under the name of the Prince, from whom the servants of the Crown had derived their commissions. James himself had, for more than 17 months, exercised the royal function in Ireland. He was certainly *de facto*, if not *de jure*, King. The rebellion of the Irish must, therefore, be founded on the supposition, that their allegiance is transferable by the Parliament of England. A speculative opinion can scarcely justify the punishment of a great majority of a people. The Irish ought to have been considered as enemies, rather than rebels."—*Hist. Great Britain.*

[2] Debates on the Popery Laws.

OBSERVATIONS
ON
THE PRESENT
STATE OF THE POLICE
OF
THE METROPOLIS.

BY GEORGE B. MAINWARING, ESQ.

Preventive justice is, upon every principle of reason, of humanity, and of sound policy, preferable in all respects to punishing justice.
BLACKSTONE.

SECOND EDITION.

PRINTED EXCLUSIVELY FOR THE PAMPHLETEER.

[*Concluded from No. XXXVIII.*]

LONDON:
1822.

OBSERVATIONS,

&c.

LET me not be thought to disparage the efforts of those who are advancing the civilisation and knowledge of man; but if, from the variegated condition of society, the instruction in question must be thus limited, are we to rely upon education *alone*, as the charm by which crime is to be dissipated? The BIBLE, it may be said, is the safeguard against temptation; that nothing more is wanting, and that it affords a comprehensive answer to such reasoning. Granting, however, that the contents of that sacred volume were retained in the memory, and its spirit, for a time, felt in the mind, still, from the very nature of man, we must remember that it is not only necessary that good principles be given, but that they must be *preserved;* and such is the collision of human intercourse, that in a population offering every species of seduction, it is an indispensable duty (as well as necessary security) to create some more positive check against the contingencies of vicious association, than the declining influences of education and religion can in *such* a state afford. In short, I fear, after all, that restraint from doing wrong will be more powerful than the admonition to do right. It is, therefore, to this restraint that we must look; and if I am correct in the view which I have just taken, its moral influence will be unquestionable; it will force back the criminal, it will obstruct his progress in the road which he has chosen, and drive him to the selection of another, which will carry him to a happier and a better end. It is to the rising generation, as the objects of our peculiar commiseration, that our care should be most earnestly directed; for it is upon the more apt and better educated that temptation now operates. A dull listless youth is no fit subject for the experienced thieves of this town; but if he be adroit, active, and daring, he is soon discovered, he is quickly and easily trained, and thus he, who might have become an useful, is made a most pernicious member of society.

It will be obvious that these latter observations apply exclusively to the laborious classes of the community in this metropolis; to those who are devoted to the handicraft or mechanical operations of life, whose time, if at work, must necessarily be absorbed; or who, if not at work, must be subject to all the evils which idleness produces; who must also be exposed to the temptations, and invited by the facilities, which a wealthy metropolis opens to the commission of crime; a metropolis, where the frequency of offences, and the number of offenders, soon weaken the impressions with which the young may have embarked in life, and finally lead them on, without fear or shame, to acts from which they might originally have shrunk with horror. For such persons, so circumstanced, there must be a more decided counterpoise against these mischiefs, than the sort of education which we have been considering.

If I could now indulge a hope that I had satisfactorily proved the necessity and shown the means and the result of an efficient police, I should here conclude, in the expectation of better prospects than I have hitherto drawn: but the public has been so long directing their attention to secondary rather than to primary causes; or, to speak more properly, applying correctives to consequences, rather than attempting to remove the grievances which have occasioned them, that our visible and sensible mischiefs have become almost the *only* sources of our solicitude.

These *consequences*, therefore, cannot be neglected, when we find them acting with so powerful an effect upon society, and will, more than all that has been hitherto said, irresistibly prove the necessity and efficacy of original prevention. The class in nearest affinity to the higher description of offenders, namely, the receivers of stolen goods, strikingly exemplifies this view: we are told, that if there were no receivers, there would be no thieves; but (granting incidental exceptions) I maintain, with reference to prior causes, that the *converse* is the true proposition, and that we have been brought into the fallacy of so unreasonable a notion, by tolerating the causes which have produced these receivers, instead of having endeavoured to destroy the means, without which they never could have had existence.

The persons in question, though a criminal, must be originally considered as a mere commercial, body; for there must have been some pre-existing circumstances to have excited their illicit avarice. Before any number of receivers or buyers appeared, there must have been an adequate number of sellers, with whose commodities purchasers might expect to carry on a profitable trade; therefore it is absurd to transpose these two classes, and to substitute effects for causes; and if, notwithstanding the powerful secondary influence which the receivers now have, it can be made manifest that it *is* entirely secondary; by removing the sources of their existence, we destroy their influence, and necessarily cause them to disappear.

We shall probably best understand the necessity of thus reaching these obnoxious persons, by considering whether any of the measures hitherto attempted against them have been, or are likely to be, effectual; and thence we shall obviously discover the policy of those at which we are aiming.

I regret the want of information which would enable me to produce a correct estimate of the known receivers in London; but I have availed myself of the best practical means to obtain their number and residences in the two districts where local opportunities and advantages have facilitated my inquiry upon the subject. From authorities, upon which I can fully rely, I find that there are within, or closely bordering upon, the district of Worship-street, twenty-five, and in that of Marlborough-street one hundred and eighty-six, receivers of stolen goods.[1]

Now, the very soul and being of their traffic are secresy, confidence, and every wicked contrivance which the most subtle and refined craft can produce. How otherwise does it occur, that of the hundreds and thousands of the common thieves, and as common traffickers with the receivers, of the former there are so many, and of the latter so few, who suffer? —The nature of their commerce, and the character of their almost exclusive customers, will afford the solution of this difficulty. Detection under our present system can rarely be accomplished but through those *immediately* dealing with them, or cognizant of their transactions. And is it probable that by *their* means the receivers will be discovered?—Will the spoliator annihilate the only mart for his spoils?—Is it his interest to destroy the means of his own criminal existence?—*Before* the plunderer is apprehended, it cannot, therefore, be expected that he will conduct us to the receptacle of his plunder. But it may be thought, that *when* apprehended, tried, or convicted, he may unfold this system of iniquity: in a few isolated cases it may so happen; but such is the stratagem of receivers, and the celerity with which they act, that upon most occasions, unless discovery and apprehension *immediately* follow the information against them, all *future* advantage from it is generally lost. Their eyes are every where, and they instantly know every movement in the criminal community, long before it is seen by the public. But, if it were not for such causes, they have but an imperfect knowledge of the characters of experienced London offenders, who calculate upon any material diminution of the receivers through *their* means. Daily observation proves to us, that as their hearts become more hardened, their minds become more firm, or rather obstinate in their resolutions; and hence it is that we see victim after victim determined to ascend the scaffold to be launched into eternity, rather than consign to a similar or even a lesser sacrifice a more guilty confederate.

---

[1] I have not now the opportunity of procuring the same detailed account from the Worship-street district as from Marlborough-street. The former applies to the larger and more opulent dealers, the nature of whose traffic will be hereafter described.

But conceding for a moment that the moral obstacles to the apprehension of these dealers might be in some degree overcome, still we shall find, that the legal difficulties of ultimate conviction must always be such, as to frustrate very materially the operation of any enactment of which they might be the peculiar objects.

Were the confederates of receivers more frequently their accusers than we have hitherto found them, their testimony must be generally too questionable to rely upon as the means of conviction. The merciful principle of our laws requires in circumstantial evidence such close unequivocal demonstration, as to bring but comparatively few dealings between thieves and receivers to a tangible legal proof; implied morally-convincing proof will exist in numberless cases, which will amount to nothing more; and unless in those where the first process of attack and of robbery be watched, and the progress of the plunderers kept in view to the destined place of deposit, and that too at a time, and at a season, and under circumstances when the receiver could (legally speaking) have no other than a guilty knowledge of his visitors, and of their dealings; I say, that in few, but in such cases, will the *violenta presumptio* be admissible, which is to constitute that essence of this traffic on the part of the receivers, which is the *knowing* (in its legal acceptation) the goods to be stolen.

There is also, in the free spirit and necessarily unrestrained course of our commerce, that which must prevent too minute and rigorous an investigation of its operations, and consequently embarrass and impede inquiry into the transactions of those who are even criminally engaged in them.

It must therefore appear that this traffic is so covert, upon general principles so impervious to detection, and so peculiarly calculated to frustrate ultimate conviction, that it would be vain to expect its extirpation by any laws which have been, or may be enacted to destroy it.

But what we have been adverting to, constitutes by no means *all* that we have to meet in our conflicts with the offenders in question. This system has become a science in *itself*. It has opened such prospects, and has been productive of so much wealth to its professors, as to call forth ingenuity and foresight to a degree which is rarely exhibited in the most artfully contrived schemes of commercial avarice. I shall best explain the refinements of these adepts, by a reference to the detail which has furnished me with the knowledge of their operations. It should be observed, that exclusive of the notorious receivers of this town, most of whose receptacles are as well known to our police, as the fair tradesman with his calling upon his door, there is a description of them who combine an unity of different characters in the same person, who are at once thieves and receivers, and who so contrive their machinations, as to exclude from observation any point of reachable or vulnerable contact.

"Thieves, as well as receivers, have various houses where information is received of any important robbery, which is termed a '*put-up job*.' When the stolen goods are purchased by the receiver, they are *immediately* removed from his *known* dwelling-house to another, termed the '*plant*,' which is, in fact, his secret warehouse, and to which the goods capable of being identified, as well as most others, are conveyed as soon as purchased. Sometimes one house is used for this purpose by two or more receivers; though both are probably connected, one is generally ignorant of the other's deposit, each having separate locks to their own doors.

"This place is generally kept, or inhabited, by a person with some ostensible occupation, who is cognizant of the purposes for which the receptacle is taken, but who is not concerned in the dealings of those who have placed him there. When a robbery has excited much public attention, the plunder is usually kept in this *plant* till the general sensation has subsided—then, as opportunities occur, the property is disposed of—it is conveyed to and from the *plant*, by means best calculated to prevent observation and detection—in hackney-coaches, little carts, by porters, upon jack-asses, or by any ordinary means of carrying goods. The great dealers have their own furnaces to melt plate *instantly:* valuable watches, and other goods capable of identity, are commonly sent abroad: watches, if kept at home are, as they call it, '*new christened*,' (the gold cases exchanged for silver or common metal); jewellery, trinkets, &c., disposed of to dealers at fairs, linen to hawkers, wearing-apparel to traders from the country, who come to London to buy stock."

The obvious advantage of this *plant* is, that whilst plunder lies there in security, and is buried, as they term it, "*to grow*;" the dealers have the opportunity of finding, from time to time, the most lucrative means of gradually disposing of the secreted property, and of carrying on their transactions without the observation of the public or the suspicion of the police.

Thus it is with these occult and dastard workers of iniquity; he, who in the prosecution of his criminal purpose sets his life upon the cast, may, if his throw be unsuccessful, excite an involuntary sympathy; but what can we feel for these heartless miscreants? they who, if not the authors, are the promoters of crime, and who, when once established, keep up the constant stimulus to its commission; who fatten alike upon the spoils of poverty or of wealth, and who themselves live the while in comparative security; or, as the law is, (if punished at all,) have to experience a fate short of that, by which many, even comparatively children in the ways of sin, have been prematurely sacrificed to the justice of their country. What human punishment is too severe for these wretches? Is, then, nothing to be done with them?—yes, if we deal with them rightly. We have tried law, it has failed; let us then try police. It is not easy to apprehend, it is very difficult to convict them; but we may know them, we may become acquainted with their habitations and their hiding places: let us watch them, follow them, mark them down, wherever they rest; they must *know* that we do so: let them constantly feel this observance, and we need not legislate against them; they will quickly vanish: the eye of police will be shunned, though the arm of the law may not be dreaded.

A most intelligent officer, who has made these persons the object of his peculiar attention, has most strongly confirmed to me the foregoing observations. He had tried, he said, every thing against the receivers; but he added in his emphatic language, "Nothing would ever do, but 'watching the pit's mouth;' do that with constancy, and the receivers fall to the ground." Need I then ask, if any thing but police can do this? or can any harm ensue from the mere vigilance which is here recommended?

Our public-houses have excited perhaps a greater interest than that which belongs to the foregoing object, upon the presumption that they, like the receivers, have been productive of, rather than consequent upon, our present state of society.

The observations upon this branch, must be but a repetition of the same principles of reasoning which have been applied to the receivers. That public-houses may, by the opportunities which they afford to free and promiscuous association, lead to considerable mischief, no one can deny: but this is not the main question which we are to try; what we have to ascertain is, whether they have been the cause of the *particular* mischiefs which we seek to remedy, and whether under existing circumstances any measures, however rigorous, against them, would now produce the desired effect.

Here again we may observe the same erroneous notion to have prevailed, upon the effect of our regulations with regard to publicans, as to receivers. Indeed, considering the political uses and advantages of the publican's trade, the jurisdiction to which it is *primarily* subjected seems to have in it a manifest inconsistency both of principle and of practice. The publicans are traders in commodities sanctioned and *encouraged* by the state, and contribute largely to its exigencies; therefore, upon a *first* view it would appear that they should be favored and invited by the legislature; yet their admission is checked by restraint with which few other trades are attended. However, it is not the *restraint* that is questionable, but the *point* at which it begins, and the fallacy which makes publicans, *as* publicans, objects of jealousy, when the legislature had previously (by implication, at least,) considered them to be objects of encouragement; moreover treating them as dangerous, and yet taking no efficient measures to prevent their doing harm.

It is necessary to check the abuses of their trade, but it is also necessary to see whether the abuses to which it is now subject, be attributable to the publicans or to other causes; and if not to them, whether they should, as a body be exposed to a constitutional mistrust which attaches upon hardly any other description of persons. They may, from the nature of their dealings, augment the evils of a bad state of society; but their means of doing so much have arisen from causes not of their own production. Publicans can produce little inconvenience by the facilities which they afford to *criminal* intercourse, until the general mass of delinquents be such, as to make their congregation mischievous at any point of attraction. A few miserable prowlers about the town casually falling into a public-house, could never make the publican obnoxious; his interest would prevent his becoming so; he would never sacrifice a respectable house to a few straggling outcasts, who could not benefit him. Therefore, *before* publicans could have had any very baneful operation, criminals must have existed in such numbers as to make them a source of advantage to the persons receiving them. But when the spread of bad associations had become so extensive, as collectively to form *a society*, and that society could almost *exclusively* support a trade; then, and not *till* then, would publicans avail themselves of such customers; and thus it is that *flash houses* (as they are called), houses devoted to the reception of the worst characters, originated in the metropolis. Hence, we must perceive that it is bad associations that make the bad publican; personally he may have all the vices of all his customers, but without *their* collision *his* vices could not spread or materially diffuse any pernicious influence over the community.

Upon this head may we not once more recur to police? When the publican becomes bad, ascertain his course, watch his house, enter it, and mark his criminal guests,—follow them in, pursue them when out,—they will not long go thither; their custom will be lost, and the publican (against his will) be forced to a better life; and thus, however strong the desire, the power to do evil would be destroyed. Can legislation, can mere annual magisterial jurisdiction, do this? We have tried their efficacy, and where are we. But in this, as in other branches of our inquiry, the simplicity and the infallibility of police is its great virtue; it produces practical good, at the expense, when rightly administered, of no political inconvenience.

In considering, however, the publicans of London as a body it is impossible to free them from magisterial control; their commodity is alone an adequate ground of *after* restraint; for if we could suppose for a moment the complete extinction of professed thieves throughout the metropolis, still the very assemblages of persons to which the publicans are exposed, the advantage which they derive from the number of their guests, and the heats and disturbances incidental to the congregation of various persons liable to be inflamed by intoxicating liquors, should subject those who receive them to a strong and powerful guard over their conduct; but it should be an *efficient* guard.

It is easier to state remedies than to prove their practicability; therefore, in questioning old usages, it is not only necessary to disprove their efficacy, but to show, by all reasonable presumption, that others might be successfully substituted for them. To meet these two views we must examine our practice as it is, with regard to public-houses, and next ascertain whether it be susceptible of beneficial alteration. Magistrates in this town exercise a caution which is likely to prevent, as much as possible, the admission of improper characters into the trade that we are now considering. It may therefore be inferred, that the body of publicans is, in its primary establishment, as well filled as can reasonably be expected. But it is to the *after* discipline that the defects of our present system are attributable.

A licence being obtained, a recognizance is entered into, in the penal sum of 10*l.*, under certain conditions of good conduct. Let us, however, observe how the publican is circumstanced, when once embarked in his trade, and what are the practical checks to which he is exposed. He is subject to no avowed or certain revision of his conduct till the expiration of a year; and, in the mean time, what are the minor intermediate acts of jurisdiction which are likely to influence his conduct? We must suppose, (as is frequently the case,) that a publican soon finds it to be his interest, upon the failure of right, to resort to wrong means of subsistence, and that he consequently keeps a disreputable house; he will then, probably, become the object of representation to the district magistrates: he will, of course endeavour to avert the consequences of such representation; but if there be repeated complaints against him, and those complaints be followed by conviction, he will naturally calculate whether his misconduct be likely to deprive him of a renewed licence to his house; and if he be but commonly wary and attentive to his interest, he will consider how he may ultimately avoid the evils which threaten him. Here begins the transfer system. In such a case, before the time of dismissal comes, he will endeavour to retire, and find a successor to his house: the extent of his delinquency may not be known to the magistrates sanctioning the transfer of his licence; indeed, if he be succeeded by a better tenant, the transfer would seem to be a benefit, rather than an injury, to the *public;* and thus a convicted publican, who had exposed himself to the almost certain forfeiture of his licence, is enabled to move away, not only unhurt and without loss, but with possible advantage.

Whilst retiring from one district, this same publican is negotiating admission to a fresh house in another, in which with the aid of the necessary testimonials, and from ignorance of his real character, he quickly establishes himself.

Thus it is that a convicted publican may, with impunity, traverse the town from one end to the other.

Should I be told that this is not a fair view of the existing jurisdiction over publicans, and that there is an intermediate control between the grant and renewal of licences, by fines for misconduct, with its heavier judgment by the forfeiture of the recognizance; we must examine the operative efficacy of the jurisdiction in question, as to any of the purposes for which it was given.

The imposition of fine by money-payment cannot be a punishment upon transgression, in cases where the profit upon the offence exceeds the penalty upon its commission. As a simple comparative calculation, therefore, he who considers profit *alone*, without ulterior consequences, will hesitate little upon the course which may daily present to him the alternative of *certain* advantage on the one side, and the *chance* only of a partial payment on the other.

Applying this self-evident proposition to our present purpose, the fines upon the publican's behaviour must appear to be too futile to be considered in *themselves* as the means of punishment. If not followed by other ulterior consequences, what check can they be to the evils which they are intended to remedy? We have a penalty of 10*s*. for suffering tippling;—when more than as many pounds may be gained by the running of the spirit-taps during forbidden seasons, with a reasonable prospect of *thorough* impunity, and with little more than a contingent apprehension of an abatement of 10*s*. for the prohibited practice. Can we call this punishment, or the power which inflicts it, an efficient jurisdiction? Again, for gaming there is a 40*s*. penalty,—larger in amount, but with all the temptations which the visits and the custom of the profligate and expensive afford to the publican, can it be expected that the penalty will prevent this practice either? If we proceed to the 10*l*. recognizance (the preliminary guarantee), we find a nominal security, and nothing more. As an instrument by itself to form the foundation of legal process, it is complete waste paper, and its use altogether obsolete. For it is worthy to be noted, in the investigation of abuses and supposed checks, that this latter, and apparently most efficient restraint upon publicans, is almost practically unknown, and its usage forgotten; and I find, upon inquiry, that but one instance of process, which went to the forfeiture of a recognizance, can be found during the last forty years in the county of Middlesex. The answer that there ought to have been many, will afford no satisfactory amends for the long continuance of nugatory provisions to meet serious evils.

By some, perhaps, these fines will be considered as marks only which are afterwards to be exhibited as evidence against the publican. That though the daily acting magistrate cannot by these fines punish the delinquent, yet they serve as denotations of his character in the proscribed list for annual review and visitation in the month of September. Should I, however, have correctly described the means by which the judgment upon his conduct may be then evaded, the reply is already given to any observations which may be made upon the reasoning that I have adopted. The offences are exhibited, the penalties recorded; but the offender is gone, and all power and authority over *him*.

There is nothing, I fear, but a summary jurisdiction which can defeat these evasions; but it should be really summary, that is to say, prompt and effective, instead of tardy and inoperative; and the penalties which it inflicts should be real, not nominal: instead, therefore, of noting and marking down offences for future retribution, we should (the offence being proved) proceed to the judgment which the law may award.

At present the publican is subjected to a fine of 10*s*., as the forfeiture incurred by his moral guilt in *that* character; when we may have the same man before us on the same day, exposed to the payment of 10*l*., because, as an *inhabitant* of London, he may have committed the civil-created offence of removing from his own house some of his own dust or ashes! Is any comment required upon this inconsistent application of law, supposing the money penalty is *all* that the offender will probably incur?

Nothing is further from the intention of these observations, than to arraign the general principle or the objects of our penal statutes; private must yield to public convenience, where individual negligence or interest interferes with the general comfort of the community: but if it has been thought necessary to create a new code with strong enactments applied to certain civil transgressions, it is surely as necessary *effectively* to carry the principle and the operation of our penal statutes to those moral offences which are productive of infinitely more evil than many which are now so heavily visited. And is it therefore too much to say, that if the inhabitant be fineable 10*l*. for converting (perhaps innocently) his own supposed property to his own use, five or ten times that imposition would be too severe a measure of punishment for certain *extreme* cases to which he, the same person, may expose himself as a publican? In the one, he does what the law of man forbids, and to which he must submit; in the other he may perhaps, be violating the law of God, and be the author of its wide-spreading violation amongst hundreds and thousands of others. If, therefore, our practice be inconsistent, should it not be brought to conform with the principles of comparative justice?

Reverting then to my original observations upon this head, and to the prospective jealousy to which publicans are now subject, I feel that these persons need be no more the objects of apprehension than other tradesmen, if police were to guard the public from the effects of the peculiar abuses which are incidental to their calling.

In considering the means to be used for the amelioration of our licensing system, the immense capital which is employed in public-houses, and their supply, must be most *sacredly* regarded and preserved. The brewers and the distillers, who contribute so largely to the commerce, agriculture, and revenue of the country, are entitled to every protection which the state can, consistently with the morals and welfare of the people, afford them; but, upon the best reflection which I can give to the subject, I am persuaded that the present is not, even to *them*, a desirable system. It would now be the height of injustice at once to alter our practice so as to invade property which has been embarked under regulations to which they have hitherto trusted; and, if these regulations cannot be changed but to their injury, it would be fatal to any attempted improvement, however apparently beneficial.

But viewing the subject upon those enlarged principles of policy which ought to govern one of such magnitude, I feel that it would be better at once to open the trade (subjected to revenue licences), and restrain it by such *after* efficacious provisions as would, in its prosecution, conduce to the real good conduct of the publican, than to continue the present insufficient, inoperative system. If it be thought that a number of needy and profligate adventurers would rush into a trade so congenial with their characters and habits, and divert the fair profits of the respectable publican, the answer is, that effectual police and restraint would, in a short time, be effectual exclusion. Even as things are, I have known the worst houses destroyed by police alone. Keep a constant eye upon the bad characters who resort to them; bear in mind the publican's conduct, prevent his transfer; the trade will be lost, the licence fall, and the house be quickly deserted. The control once established, the profligate adventurer will not very anxiously desire to place himself under it, at any sacrifice.

Thus our commercial freedom would be preserved, and I trust that an effective discipline would be maintained also. To be effective, however, an *instant* revision will be necessary of those offences which it is its object to visit. Due opportunities of defence being allowed, the offence should, when proved, be followed by *immediate* punishment. If gross misconduct be clearly established, the offender must be dealt with *flagrante delicto*, or he will rarely be dealt with effectually. If fines be imposed, they should by their varying adaptation to the varying shades of delinquency be such as (according to all probability) will prevent its repetition. In short, fines should be *punishments*, and the loss thereby ensuing be more than an equivalent to the gains of the actual abuses which have produced them. If again the offence be of that enormity for which public justice requires a public example, and the licence *must* be cancelled, let the law be administered to that end with due caution and solemnity, but with a promptitude which shall prevent its evasion. In the latter case, perhaps, a *public* and more solemn tribunal may be necessary than the ordinary course of magisterial jurisdiction admits; but this might be easily provided for, in any enactment which the object in question might seem to require.

Let us also observe, if property be likely by such course to be affected, except in those cases where it *ought* to be. If the house be the publican's he will *knowingly* incur the penalty upon his own delinquency; and though the brewer and distiller might sustain a temporary diminution of trade from *his* removal, yet a new house might, in such a case, be licensed to a respectable successor in the same district, to the supply of which the former brewer aud distiller might (if a free house) be afforded the *original* option; more as a free house they could not expect. If the house be the supplier's, then he might have the advantage of a new tenant in the same house, care being especially taken that no collusive arrangement be resorted to between the dismissed and admitted tenant. Thus the property of the unoffending party would not be damnified, and the law would have its force unobstructed by those influences which make the better parts of our nature contribute to the worst results.

However, it should be observed, that public must not be sacrificed to private considerations:—an indulgence is here proposed to the brewer; but it must have its limit: otherwise, upon the foregoing view, he *might*, *ad infinitum*, nominate successively the worst publicans to the worst houses: therefore a responsibility must rest with the supplier; and if the *same* house be the scene of repeated transgression, then the property *must* suffer; and it cannot be expected that a *third* licence should be granted to a house, the forfeiture of which had been *twice* incurred.

According to our present course of proceeding, with regard to this trade, the time between the offence and the punishment lets in so much indulgent consideration for property, so much intercession in favor of offenders, that the severer resolutions of the most upright relax into their more natural sympathies, and public justice (to say the least) *may* be sacrificed to private feeling. It could not be so, if magistrates were *compelled* to take instant cognizance; the parties would then appear before them with their cases fresh in the minds of the accusers, and with their full weight upon the accused; the public eye would be upon those who administer the law, and the public judgment formed upon its due administration.

Having confined myself abstractedly to the subject of police, and having, however imperfectly, adverted to its defects, I hope that I have made it appear that there is much belonging to it which is susceptible of improvement; if I have done this, I shall be fully satisfied with my humble efforts.

I am, nevertheless, aware, that there are amongst those who have been more peculiarly reflecting upon the various means for the practical improvement of the police, some who are of opinion, that the prompt administration of justice and instant punishment would, upon the very principle of alarm, be the most powerful remedy to which we could resort. With this view, such persons urge the establishment of a permanent uninterrupted Court of Judicature for the immediate trial of offenders. Undoubtedly there is much of the reasoning applicable to police, which will apply also to this suggested improvement—it may to a degree prevent the present calculations founded upon the chances between apprehension and trial; and so far as it might lessen the supposed security, would have an intimidatory influence upon the criminal. But we must observe, that if even a daily tribunal were sitting to receive offenders at its bar, *unless* a preventive police were on foot, they might still reckon upon impunity, and indulge the hope that they should not be carried to that bar; for the means of instant trial, without the fear of probable apprehension, would not *alone* check the career of the more experienced class of town-depredators. Besides, although it may be desirable to improve the *practice* of our laws, we must take care to hold those *principles* sacred which are identified with the Constitution itself, and out of which Constitution no laws should spring that do not bear the character of their common parent.—Bearing in mind the benevolent principle, that it is better that ninety-nine guilty escape, than one innocent person should suffer, it has been wisely provided that ample time be afforded for all the means of defence within the power of a prisoner; and the question will be, whether in the possible rapidity with which a prosecution might be gone through under the proposed alteration, such means would be always allowed:—if they were given, and time granted almost at the request of a prisoner, the arts and stratagems now practised would still continue; if *no* indulgence were shown, the meditated change would be subject to the dreaded contingency against which our present periodical judicatures have so humanely guarded.

It has occurred to me, that our police offices might have the constitution of an occasional court of judicature, and the assistance of a jury once, perhaps, in every week or fortnight, to try the minute and lower class of larcenies; to the insignificance or early neglect of which description of offences, is too frequently to be ascribed the subsequent career of crime and misery amongst thousands of the wretched and pitiable children in the metropolis. Magistrates must indeed witness the lamentable effects produced from the want of some decisive check to arrest the fatal course of these "little ones," at a period of their lives when we might rationally hope that it would be really effectual.

In pursuing the proposed suggestion, it must also be observed, that to *whatever* class of offences or offenders such an instantaneous jurisdiction be applicable, the *principle* of mercy and of reasonable delay is the same. Moreover, it should be recollected, that the operation of the plan must either supersede the use of a grand jury, and thereby break down one of the great barriers of our liberties, or it must require grand juries to be almost constantly sitting, and encroach to an intolerable degree upon the time, convenience, and occupations of the most useful portion of the community. The establishment of this power in the acting magistracy would, it must be observed, combine the incipient and ultimate jurisdiction in the same persons; an union not in conformity with the general spirit of their administration.

Finally, we must be aware that the recurrence of our session eight times in the year leaves but the interval of a very few weeks between every gaol-delivery; and when we consider the *average* of time during which prisoners are holden between their final commitment and trial, not much more is given than may in many cases be required for the reasonable means of defence; except during the summer and occasionally variable vacations, when, perhaps, an intermediate delivery might not be unadvisable to meet such exceptions.

I submit these observations for the consideration of others, rather than with the intention to offer any decided opinion upon a subject, on which the better experience of those presiding and engaged in courts of criminal judicature, will enable them to form a more satisfactory judgment; but we must, above all things, be mindful lest in our laudable and zealous anxiety to reclaim or punish the guilty, we attack those safeguards which have hitherto protected the innocent.

I have thus endeavoured to discuss such general heads of police as will, I hope, lead to its better investigation in abler hands;—these, with the important object of prison-discipline, form, I think, the main points which are necessary to the right understanding of the present subject. Our prison-management already occupies so large a share of public attention, and I have given my thoughts so fully thereupon to the magistrates of this county, that it is altogether superfluous here to enter upon it.

In recurring to the foregoing pages, I am sensible that much has been omitted which a proper view of the subject might seem to require. With my best industry, and most undivided attention, it must have been so;—however, I have forborne, from obvious motives, to speak at any length of that body of which I am myself a member.

Having successively reviewed the subordinate parts of our police system, the head of that system, namely, the police magistracy, has been comparatively excluded from the inquiry. I am, therefore, brought to the inevitable alternative of abandoning this part of the subject, or of going into it fairly and fully; in the one case, relinquishing public considerations; in the other, introducing those, in which private feeling or interest may be supposed to have their influence. In this alternative, if I go on (as I feel that I ought to do), let me hope that the reasoning, and not the writer, may be judged;—or if he must be judged, let him be tried upon those principles which, in their general analogies are applicable to the ordinary course of human action;—as the whole conduct of a man is the evidence whereby his motives, dispositions, and principles are to be ascertained, so should the context of an author's reflections be conclusively the criterion of the heart and mind with which he writes.

In explaining myself upon the general formation of the police, I observed that the public estimation of the magistrates formed one of the most powerful sources of a vigorous, effective, and beneficial administration of justice. Individual talent, and intrinsic weight of character, will doubtless in this country ensure the respect of a discerning public; their influence is certain, and generally proportioned to their powers to command it. But, with all this, society has thought fit to cover and invest situation with its appropriate attributes, whenever political expediency makes it necessary to add to personal qualifications other adventitious accompaniments; upon this principle it is, that the exterior advantages in question have been usually adapted to the nature and character of the station, and of its desired influence upon society. Every station should, therefore, have about it that description of *characteristic* support, which is calculated to produce the best operative effect upon that part of society to which its services are destined.

Applying this reasoning to the magistracy of the metropolis, we may reasonably conclude, that a body daily exposed to public observation, and invested with great powers, comes closely within the spirit of those views which have been formed upon *public* rather than on private grounds. If therefore it be the interest of the state to uphold the laws, and to give force to their administration, it becomes equally its interest to afford to those who administer them, that constitutional weight in society, which shall be conducive to this result, and to take from them all possible disadvantages, which shall diminish that weight, or render them obnoxious to unfavorable observations, arising out of the very constitution of their office.

Now, it cannot be denied, that there exists in this country a strong constitutional jealousy against a stipendiary magistracy.

The attachment to our laws has arisen, amongst their other excellencies, from the respect to those who administer them.

A national independent and gratuitous magistracy, giving their time, their learning, and their efforts to the preservation of the peace and good order of society, and the due administration of the laws throughout the country, reconciles all, even to their severest exercise, inasmuch as it proves that general good, and no sinister motive or interest, can actuate those who so engage in the public service.

It is opinion indeed, which constitutes the great charm in the administration of justice; wherever, therefore, and under whatever circumstances our laws are in question, it is most essential to preserve it. I am aware that these reflections bring me to the solution of a difficulty which requires the most serious consideration; namely, how is our police magistracy to be so constituted as to harmonize with this general feeling of the country? If I were at once to say, look to the judges, and to the act which sealed their independence, the observation might very reasonably ensue, that even the English magistracy cannot be said to be constitutionally independent; that the Lord Chancellor by a stroke of his pen, *may* obliterate any name from the King's commission, and that the power of the government is thus fully recognized. Is it right therefore, to afford to the paid servants of the public, immunities and privileges which their unpaid brethren do not possess? but it is because the former class *are* paid, that their independence is so peculiarly desirable. The State is obliged to our county magistrates, rather than they to the State.—The public feels it, and the government knows it. But can such a feeling prevail with respect to a stipendiary body? or, rather, will not the feeling be (well or ill grounded is not the question,) that the members of such a body, are the servants of the government, instead of the independent guardians of the public interest? Is not such a sentiment, above all things calculated to lessen the weight, and to weaken the moral influence of those whose power over public opinion is one of the most certain means of producing a cheerful obedience to the laws?

This view is by no means chimerical—I have more than once had occasion to know, that a dissatisfied suitor, upon a decision adverse to his wishes, has publicly threatened to appeal to the Secretary of State. Without saying how the magistrate would feel and express himself upon such an occasion, the noble Secretary alluded to, would undoubtedly reply, (with that just and constitutional sentiment which would govern his mind, upon such communication,) "Go to the Court of King's Bench, make your complaint to the judges, and they will do you justice;"—but the very prejudice that could give rise to such a supposed intimidation ought not to find its way into the mind of an Englishman. Who ever heard the murmur, the merest whisper to a judge, of such an appeal; that his judicial acts should be amenable to a ministerial revision! It is an incident hardly within rational calculation, and why is it not? Because the judges by the ever-memorable instance of our late good King's sound constitutional principles and true foresight of their best practical application, were by him made independent. He said, in fact, to the judges, "I renounce all power over you; you are servants of my appointment, but once appointed, you become the servants of the public for *their* good; that good will be best consulted by making you independent of every thing *but* the law; by serving the public faithfully and without fear, you will most effectually serve me."

Looking then to our police magistracy, to its desired influence upon public opinion, and to the general analogy of its jurisdiction with that of the venerable personages in question, the inference must inevitably follow, that a constitutional independence would afford to the inferior, what it has so beneficially given to the superior order of public functionaries.

Upon a part of the subject which has never yet been publicly agitated, it were vain to expect a general coincidence with these views, and unless there were, it would hardly be desirable to entertain them; because, upon a question which is so fortunately excluded from the political feeling or conflicts of the day, it would be most unwise in the sincere advocate of practical improvement to be the means of exciting them; but when the practice of sixty eventful years has successfully illustrated the soundness of the principles to which this reasoning is referable, surely it is worthy of those, whose province it will be to give the most efficacious system to the country, to weigh well *all* the considerations and suggestions of which the subject is susceptible.

For myself, so strongly and warmly do I feel upon this important branch of the subject, that were I a fit petitioner, and might be permitted to enter the presence of my sovereign, I should for these reasons, supplicate the gracious boon of an independent magistracy for the metropolis of his empire; and I should do so with the more confidence, from the conviction that my petition would be heard, and its prayer be considered, if it had for its object the interests of the people; satisfied as I am, that the welfare of his subjects is the wish of the Monarch, and that the principles of the Constitution are the leading guides and landmarks of his course.

Under such impressions, it is painful to bring the mind to the minute difficulties which partial objectors interpose to the more enlarged views of moral and national improvement; but the influence of such persons is too considerable to be disregarded; and they maintain, that the magistracy must be so frequently in a state of intercourse with the government, and that the government ought to have such a complete cognizance of its acts, that whatever may tend to separate the police from those who have the management of the country, would obstruct their operations, not only in the general system of our domestic administration, but would possibly in some extreme political emergencies be productive of serious inconvenience to the public, —that an implied dependence (for there is now it may be said, little more) contributes to that deference to the wishes of government which political expediency renders necessary, and that a thorough constitutional independence would give such a degree of free will and power of individual action, as in possible cases to defeat some of the great purposes of an established police.

In reply to this, it must be remembered, that the body in question is comparatively but of recent origin; that before its institution we had riots, and every species of incidents in which the government may have been peculiarly interested; that the powers of the Constitution were always sufficient to subdue them—but further, it must be observed, that the duty, the allegiance, and the oath of every magistrate are the guarantees for his co-operation, whenever it be wanted by the government; his responsibility to the State ensures it—an urgent occasion shown and proved, when his services were required, and not faithfully rendered, he will find in the law the penalty of his disobedience—but surely we are creating shadows, when the whole substance of our system demonstrates the fallacy of such fearful conjectures; our judges are independent, but they are not independent of the law;—and must not they, when necessary, confer with, report to the government, attend the peers, and do all acts to the performance of which, *ex virtute officii*, they are called, as public servants?—Would the independence of the magistracy absolve them from similar obligations?—Whatever duty requires of them now, would be equally required of them under the most established state of constitutional independence.

But really there is something in the apprehension, against which we are contending, which betrays an ignorance of common feeling, and of the principles of human action in a well-regulated state of society. Authority (in this country especially) may be said to support authority; a connexion with the institutions of the State identifies all whom they embrace, however widely extended through their various differences and degrees; there is a feeling consequent upon station, which, with very few exceptions, pervades all the authorities of the country. It descends,—it ascends, and each degree is so near to each, that there is a contact and general sympathy throughout. A magistrate may not always be attached to the persons of a government; but how rarely does it occur, that he is not attached to the government itself? or rather, how generally we find that the constitutional principles, proceeding from the very character of his office, induce the most favorable dispositions to the actual possessors of rule and authority.

I am far, indeed, from wishing to detach the police from the government; on the contrary, I am most anxious to strengthen the necessary union between them; but surely the character and power which is given to one of its constituent parts, must advance rather than frustrate their means of co-operation, whenever they may be required. The existing communication need not abate; it may be improved, and provided for: and I cannot understand why, (if I may measure other minds by my own), there may not exist with a complete magisterial independence, the same devotion to the government, and the same regard for its members that there would be under the greatest degree of supposed submission to the existing authorities of the day.

In concluding these observations, I have only to advert shortly to a possible reflection which may ensue from their perusal. Some may imagine that I entertain, and wish to encourage expectations from the effects of police, which neither the state of society, nor the nature of man, will warrant.

We are told that "offences will come," and we know too well that criminal propensities will produce criminal acts, which no human means can prevent. It is undoubtedly so, with regard to those more atrocious offences, which spring from a long-continued and deep-rooted depravity; but these do not constitute the great mass of offences which are prevalent in a wealthy and vicious metropolis; they are few indeed, comparatively with those, to which bad habits, rather perhaps, than bad hearts, had originally contributed. It is to the idle, desultory, profligate, and marauding race of freebooters, that the present state of London is principally attributable; and it is to this race which an efficacious police will alone apply. Rightly understood and administered, it will reach nine-tenths of such offenders.

Upon every consideration, then, of humanity and of sound policy, let us begin its trial; if we use not police with its milder influences, we must resort to laws with their severer inflictions. They may terrify for a moment; they may produce a pause; we may in a few instances carry our laws to extremity, but when the lives of our fellow-subjects are at issue, we cannot in this country long expect to find those who will be the willing instruments of their execution.

The consequence *must* be, again to let loose upon the public, a race which we had hoped to intimidate, with re-animated vigor and with more than former confidence in their future security. The question then is, *punishment*, or *prevention*.

THE
Electors' Remembrancer;

OR,

GUIDE

TO THE

VOTES OF EACH MEMBER

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

FOR THE

FIRST TWO SESSIONS OF THE PRESENT PARLIAMENT.

NUMBER I.

To be continued at the Close of every succeeding Session.

SECOND EDITION, WITH ALTERATIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

LONDON: 1822.

VOL. XX. *Pam.* NO. XXXIX. P 2

PREFACE.

It was Dean Swift, we believe, who suggested the following Recipe for the cure of a Glutton:—"Fill two plates with equal quantities from each dish he feeds upon. Give him one, and put the other on the Sideboard. As soon as Dinner is over, lay the latter before him; and, after two or three such exhibitions, I warrant you, unless he is a desperately bad subject, he will reform."

We have had a strange conceit in our heads for some time. It gave rise to this Pamphlet—we will communicate it to our Readers.

We fancied a round Number of the Members of a certain Great House to be great Gluttons.—We fancied them to have been feeding on a Dish that could not fail eventually to poison them.—We determined to step forward to their Rescue.—But we were dilatory;—at last, the Sufferings of those who had the providing in the different stages for the Appetites of the aforesaid Gentlemen roused us to the task of Advice. Yet we knew that many Members were incorrigible. But there was no alternative.—They were UNCONSCIOUSLY feeding on Disgrace: and could we coldly balance against the duty of preventing Moral Suicide, the danger of remonstrating with powerful Selfishness? No;—we said here is a Case which Swift alone can cure, we will fearlessly try even on such despotic Patients his Recipe. In administering it we are painfully anxious—not on our own account, but on theirs. In the hope, however, that some few Individuals, at least, out of so large a Body,[1] may sicken at the sight of their own Grossness, and reform, we have resolved to serve up to them, at the close of every Session, a Summary, faithfully compiled, of their Votes.

[1] The round number mentioned above.

ADVERTISEMENT.

As we are not of the number of those who defend libel on the principle that,

> "Si mala condiderit in quem quis Carmina, jus est,
> "Judiciumque,"

and who feel no remorse because they boldly run great risks of punishment,—and particularly as we are anonymous writers, we think it incumbent upon us, at the commencement of this work, to pledge ourselves, that in it, nothing, of the truth of which we have not a moral conviction, nothing that in the remotest degree reflects on private character, nothing that tends to wound the feelings of individuals *unnecessarily*, shall ever be inserted. We abhor slander, and wish to perform simply a public duty. Doubtless,[1] many of those gentlemen on whose Parliamentary behaviour we have very strongly animadverted, are most exemplary in their private characters.

We trust that the zealous vindicators of Parliamentary privilege will admit, that we have been scrupulously careful not to attack the potent corporation, of whose purity they are so proud; —they would hardly wish to shut out the new light which we are endeavoring to throw on their proceedings. Our views are limited to the illustration of individual character, and the facilitation of reference; and should there ever appear sufficient authority for believing that, though unintentionally, we have misrepresented either the words or conduct of any member, we shall always take the earliest opportunity of making reparation. Our readers will not fail to observe that we have carefully abstained from using, except in one instance, the term *Placeman;* we have done so, because it has become a custom latterly to apply it in a disreputable, low sense.

ABBREVIATIONS.

f.	stands for	*for*
ag.		*against*
Qu.		*Queen*
Cath. Emanc.		*Catholic Emancipation*
Rep.		*Repeal*
Red.		*Reductions*
Est.		*Estimates*
Estab.		*Establishments.*

---

[1] We willingly mention Mr. Wilberforce as an instance.

THE

ELECTORS' REMEMBRANCER,

&c. &c.

BEDFORDSHIRE.[1]

MARQ. OF TAVISTOCK. Voted for the Queen; for Catholic Emancipation; against Grant of the 18,000*l.* to Duke of Clarence; for repeal of Malt tax;[2] and for reductions.

---

[1] The public has long stood in need of a Guide to the Votes of Members of the House of Commons. To make our readers acquainted with the method we have adopted, it is necessary to state, that such votes only as were given for or against "the Queen—repeal of taxes—reductions of Establishments—grant of the arrears to Duke of Clarence—or Catholic Emancipation," are recapitulated in this pamphlet.

Where, however, members of doubtful politics, or who commonly support ministers, have sided with the Opposition on other points, their votes are also detailed.

The public are little concerned in the great party divisions, which were well enough suited to the *ad captandum* school of the old Opposition, but have scarcely even a tendency to advance the Common Weal. We say the public are little concerned in such divisions; because, though the object to be attained is frequently by no means unimportant, yet, in as much as it has been the custom to make no efficient opposition in any other shape, such debates and divisions are rather convenient for the disguise of an indisposition to real usefulness, than creative of public advantage. Hereafter, we hope that we shall not have occasion to draw this distinction, but that *party* motions will have merged in a *bonâ fide* opposition.

The votes on Reform in Parliament, and on Sir Francis Burdett's motion on the Manchester meeting, will be given in our next number, *which will be compiled on a scale of much more extensive reference than the present pamphlet.*

Will not some patriotic member favor us with lists of majorities during the present session? Our address is, "The Compilers of the Electors' Remembrancer, at Messrs. Sherwood, Neely, and Jones', Paternoster Row."

[2] Did not vote for repeal of House and Window duties, or for repeal of Agricultural Horse tax, on FIRST division. As no list of the 2d division has been published, we are only able to collect from their speeches, that some members voted for the repeal on the second division, whose names do not appear in the minority on the 1st division.

F. **Pym**. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of taxes; and f. red.

Bedford. Lord G. W. **Russell**. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu.; f. rep. of taxes; and f. red.

W. H. **Whitbread**. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of Malt tax; and f. red.

BERKSHIRE.

County. Hon. R. **Neville**. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the ministers, rather than f. the Qu.; f. rep. of taxes; and f. red.

C. **Dundas**. Voted f. rep. of taxes, and f. red.; f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.

Abingdon. J. **Maberly**. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu.; missed few opportunities of supporting Mr. Hume and Mr. Creevey.

Reading. C. F. **Palmer**, J. B. **Monck**. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; and f. almost every motion of Mr. Hume and Mr. Creevey. They were constantly at their posts, and always voted on the popular side. They both opposed the Grant to D. of Clarence.

Wallingford. W. L. **Hughes**, G. J. **Robarts**. Voted f. the Qu.; f. rep. of taxes, and red. of Est. and Estab. Mr. Hughes voted f. Cath. Emanc. Mr. Robarts' name does not appear on the division.[1] Mr. Robarts is very regular in his attendance; and has always supported Mr. Hume.

Windsor. J. **Ramsbottom**. Voted f. the Qu.; 3 times f. red.; f. rep. of Malt tax. Mr. R.'s name does not appear on the Cath. Emanc. division.

Sir H. **Taylor**. *In Office*. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.

BUCKINGHAMSHIRE.

County. Lord **Temple**. Voted f. the rep. of the Malt tax; ag. the Qu.; did not vote f. the red. of any Est. or Estab.

Hon. R. **Smith**. Voted f. the Qu.; f. the red. of Est. and Estab.; and f. rep. of taxes. His name does not appear on the Cath. Emanc. division.

Amersham. T. T. **Drake**, W. T. **Drake**. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu.;[2] did not vote f. rep. of any taxes, or red. of

---

[1] A "G. J. Roberts" appears to have voted for Grant to the Duke of Clarence of the 18,000*l*. We think it cannot be the member for Wallingford.

[2] "He that is not for us is against us;" therefore our readers will know the true import of the words "did not vote," to be rather positive than negative. The circumstance of not voting on the right side of a question is

Est. or Estab. T. T. Drake did not vote on the Grant f. D. of Clarence. W. T. Drake voted ag. it.

Aylesbury. Lord Nugent. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of taxes, and red. of Est. and Estab.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence.

W. Rickford. Voted f. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep., &c.; and f. red., &c.; voted ag. Grant to D. of Clarence. Both these gentlemen are very attentive to their duty.

Buckingham. Sir G. Nugent, W. Freemantle. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab. Sir G. Nugent voted f. Cath. Emanc.; and we believe

---

the offence. Whether members vote on the other side, or keep away, is immaterial to the public. Let this always be borne in mind: When a ministerial representative wishes to keep well with his constituents, he does not attend or divide on a question, his decision upon which, according to habitual propensities, would offend them, and thereby hurt his interests. Even a placeholder manages generally to get leave not to divide on cases of this sort.—The advantage derived from this *ruse de guerre* is often very great. On a canvass, many of the electors ask no other question, than whether the candidate did or did not vote contrary to their wishes on such an occasion; the candidate satisfies them thus far, and they give him their support. But, farther, many members of good principles would, doubtless, vote as the public wish; but these gentlemen are in the habit of not attending the House to any practical purpose during the greater part of the Session. They appear on some great occasion, as they call it, and thus the vital interests of their constituents are sacrificed to views of private convenience. Mr. Well-dressed is invited to a quadrille party at Lady Full-room's. He cuts Parliament, and is actually engaged in dancing the 8 bars in the Pastorale, while 100,000*l.* of the public money is being shamefully voted away for the Barrack-Branch alone of the army expenditure. The next morning he is in the midst of a very agreeable dream about the charming Miss De la Gorge, while the whole country is indignantly exclaiming at the unchecked extravagance of ministers. But, suppose he neither dances nor dreams—if he stays away it is all the same to the pocket of poor John Bull. It is to be hoped, that Messrs. Hume and Creevey have roused some members of this class from their habitual absenteeship. The public, they will find, were long ago sick of the selfish tactics of the old Opposition, and expect real and hearty exertions in their cause—they can dispense with studied speeches (however splendid), and require something more than mere field-day musters and occasional motions. They prefer Col. Davies to Mr. Tierney, and Sir F. Burdett and J. C. Hobhouse, to the whole Whig party.

We do not think it will be very much out of place to notice here, that on the second division on the question of the repeal of the Malt tax, 38 members who had voted for the repeal on the first division, were absent. Had they been present, their number, it is true, would not have been sufficient to have carried the repeal, but it would have reduced the ministerial majority from 97 to 59—an object, from its influence on the Cabinet, as well as on the public, quite of importance enough to have made their attendance valuable.[1]

[1] We have faithfully copied, throughout, from the lists in Debrett's Debates, and the leading newspapers.

Mr. Freemantle too, but the latter's name does not appear on division. Sir G. Nugent did not vote at all on the Qu.'s question.

Marlow, Great. O. **Williams.** Voted ag. Grant to D. of Clarence; f. red. of salaries to 1797.

T. P. **Williams.** Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. ministers on Qu.'s question, rather than f. the Qu.; f. red.

Wendover. G. **Smith.** Voted f. the Qu.; f. red.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence; f. Cath. Emanc.

S. **Smith.** Do. do. do. do.; but voted ag. Cath. Emanc.

Wycomb, Chipping. Sir J. D. **King.** Voted f. Lord A. Hamilton on Barons of Excheq. in Scot.; and ag. Grant to D. of Clarence; 3 times f. red.

Sir T. **Baring.** Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence; f. the Qu.

CAMBRIDGESHIRE.

County. Lord F. C. **Osborne.** Voted f. the Qu.; f. the red. of Est. and Estab.; did not vote f. rep. of any taxes. We do not find Lord F. C. Osborne's name on the Cath. Emanc. division.

Lord C. S. **Manners.** Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. Grant to the D. of Clarence; did not vote f. the rep. of any taxes, or the red. of Est. or Estab.

Cambridge, University. **Lord Palmerston.** *In Office.* Voted f. Cath. Emanc.

J. H. **Smyth.** Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the rep. of the Malt tax, and f. red. Does not appear to have voted on the Qu.'s case at all.

City. C. M. **Cheere.** Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of Husbandry Horse tax; ag. the Qu.; did not vote f. red. of any Est. or Estab.; voted f. Grant to the D. of Clarence.

W. F. **Trench.** Voted ag. the Qu.; f. Grant to D. of Clarence; did not vote f. rep. of any taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab. We do not find Mr. Trench's name on the Cath. Emanc. division.

CHESHIRE.

County. D. **Davenport,** W. **Egerton.** Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; with Ministers generally, except that Mr. Davenport voted f. rep. of Malt tax; and on the 2d division, not on the 1st, for rep. of Horse tax; and that he voted once ag. Ministers on the Qu.'s case, though not for the Qu.

Chester. Gen. **Grosvenor.** Seems to have attended ONCE during the 2 Sessions; he voted f. Lord A. Hamilton on Barons of Exch. in Scot.

City. Lord **Belgrave.** Voted f. the Qu.; for Cath. Emanc.; f. red. once.

CORNWALL.

County. Sir W. **Lemon**, Bart. Has been a Member of the House of Commons during an uninterrupted period of nearly 53 years. Opposed both the American and French war, and Mr. Pitt's and the present Ministry's *gagging* bills. Voted f. the Qu.; and supported motions f. rep. of taxes and f. red., as often as his health and age would allow him to attend. Was absent from the House on the Cath. Emanc. division.

J. H. **Tremayne.** A sinecure Alarmist: a supporter of Ministers from real dread of the people. Voted f. the late suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, and f. the 6 Acts—Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of the Malt tax; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence, and we are happy to add f. most of Mr. Hume's motions; but he is a man (as Gibbon says of the Nobles of Imperial Rome,) "more tenacious of property than of freedom."

Bodmin. D. G. **Gilbert.** Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; voted f. no rep. of taxes or red.

J. W. **Croker.** *In Office.* Voted f. Cath. Emanc. Has not Mr. G. Bennett got an awkward document against you, Mr. Croker?

Bossiney. Sir C. **Domville.** Voted ag. the Qu.; his name does not appear on Cath. Emanc. division; did not vote f. any rep. of taxes or f. red.

Hon. J. **Ward.** Did not vote f. the Qu.; voted f. Cath. Emanc.; did not vote f. any rep. of taxes, or f. red.

Callington. M. **Attwood,** W. **Thompson.** Did not vote f. the Qu. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Did not vote f. any rep. of taxes or red.

Camelford. Lord **Yarmouth.** *In Office.* Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.

M. **Milbank.** Voted f. the Qu. His name does not appear on Cath. Emanc. division: a very good member. One of the few who was always in his place to support Mr. Hume. He voted ag. grant to D. of Clarence.

East Looe. T. P. **Macqueen.** We do not find this member's name on any division, either on majorities or minorities, during either of the Sessions.—Quere, did he ever attend at all?

G. W. **Taylor.** Voted ag. Cath. Emanc. We do not find this gentleman's name on any other division to which we refer.

Fowey. Lord **Valletort,** G. **Lucy.** Voted ag. the Qu.;

ag. Cath. Emanc. Never f. any rep. of taxes, or f. red. Lord Valletort voted ag. rep. of Malt tax.

St. Germains. Hon. S. BATHURST. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Never f. rep. of taxes, or f. red.

Rt. Hon. C. ARBUTHNOT. *In Office.* Voted f. Cath. Emanc.

Grampound. J. INNIS. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Never f. rep. of taxes, or f. red.

A. ROBERTSON. Voted f. red. twice; ag. the rep. of the Malt tax; ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.

Helston. Lord J. TOWNSEND. If this member ever attended "nulla vestigia."

H. HUDSON. Voted ag. rep. of Malt tax. His name is not on any other division.

St. Ives. L. EVELYN. Voted ag. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Never voted f. any rep. of taxes or f. red.

Sir C. HAWKINS. Returned since prorogation.

Launceston. J. BROGDEN. *In Office.* Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.

Hon. P. B. PELLEW. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Never voted f. rep. of taxes, or f. red.

Liskeard. Hon. W. ELLIOT. Voted ag. the Qu.; f. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Never voted f. any rep. of taxes, or f. red.

S. M. PRINGLE. Voted ag. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Never voted f. any rep. of taxes, or f. red.

Lestwithiel. Sir R. WIGRAM, A. C. GRANT. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of the Malt tax; never f. rep. of taxes or f. red. A. C. Grant voted ag. Cath. Emanc., and f. Grant to the D. of Clarence. Sir R. Wigram's name is not on the divisions on either of those questions.

St. Mawes. Sir C. B. MORLAND, Dr. PHILLIMORE. Voted ag. the Qu.; f. Grant to the D. of Clarence; f. Cath. Emanc. Sir C. B. Morland voted ag. rep. of Malt tax. Dr. Phillimore did not vote on the question, but Dr. P. voted f. Lord A. Hamilton's motion on Barons of Exchequer in Scotland. Neither of these members voted f. rep. of taxes or f. red.[1]

---

[1] We have heard that Dr. Phillimore is to be attacked in the house, for having stipulated that his professional pursuits are not to be sacrificed to attendance at the India Board. We do not think the acceptance of office on this condition reflects any discredit, either on Ministers or Dr. Phillimore. If the India Board be merely one of Mr. Canning's nurseries for young statesmen, the duties of a commissioner are not so heavy as to require either constant or exclusive attention. If, on the other hand, the situation be not

St. Michael. Sir G. STAUNTON. Voted ag. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. Lord A. Hamilton's motion on Barons of Exchequer in Scotland. Never f. rep. of taxes or f. red.

W. T. MONEY. Voted ag. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of the Malt tax. Never f. any rep. of taxes or f. red.

Newport. W. NORTHEY. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc. Did not vote f. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Never f. rep. of any taxes or f. retrenchment.

J. RAINE. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or f. retrenchment.

Penryn. H. SWAN. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. Cath. Emanc. Never f. retrenchment or rep. of taxes.

P. GRENFELL. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of taxes and retrenchment.

Saltash. MATHEW RUSSELL. We have no reason f. believing that this gentleman attended at all during either of the sessions; at all events "nulla vestigia."

J. FLEMING. This member having the same christian name as the Member for Hants, we cannot decide to whom the votes in the lists should be attributed. On the Cath. Emanc. division, one of the J. Flemings voted f., and the other ag., the Bill. But *both* voted ag. the Qu. Did not vote f. rep. of any taxes, or f. red. of Est. or Estab. See *Hampshire.*

Tregony. Lord BARNARD, J. O'CALLAGHAN. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of taxes and red. of Est. and Estab. Mr. O'Callaghan attends very well.

Truro. Sir H. VIVIAN. *In Office.* Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.

W. GOSSET. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. the rep. of Malt tax; ag. Cath. Emanc. Did not vote f. rep. of any taxes or red. of any Est. or Estab. Voted f. Grant to D. of Clarence.

West Looe. HENRY GOULBURN. *In Office.* Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.

Sir C. HULSE, Bart. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Did not vote f. rep. of any taxes or red. of Est. or Estab.

CUMBERLAND.

County. J. LOWTHER. Whenever he attended, voted for Ministers. Ag. Cath. Emanc.

a sinecure, but require application, it is clearly in the power of an assiduous officer to fulfil his duties satisfactorily both at Doctors' Commons, and in Cannon Row: he has only to rise a little earlier of a morning than perhaps he may have been accustomed. That Mr. Ellis, the member for Dublin, should have been allowed to retain both his office and seat in Parliament, shocked us we own; but we see no incompatibility in what Dr. Phillimore has undertaken.

J. C. **Curwen.** Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. red. and rep. of taxes. Voted ag. Grant to D. of Clarence.

Carlisle. W. **James.** Voted f. the Qu. His name is not on Cath. Emanc. division. A most exemplary Member, one of Mr. Hume's phalanx.

Sir J. **Graham.** Voted ag. Cath. Emanc. Voted ag. the Qu.: as much the reverse of his colleague as possible. For Ministers always.

Cockermouth. J. H. **Lowther.** Voted f. Ministers on every question; ag. Cath. Emanc.

C. H. C. **Wilson.** Returned since prorogation.

DERBYSHIRE.

County. Lord G. A. **Cavendish.** Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of Malt tax. Did not vote f. any red.

E. A. **Munday.** Voted ag. Cath. Emanc. Not f. the Qu., nor f. rep. of any taxes or red. of any Est. or Estab.

Derby. H. C. **Cavendish.** Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of taxes, and red. of Est. and Estab.

T. W. **Coke**, Junior. Scarcely ever attended.

DEVONSHIRE.

County. Sir T. D. **Acland.** Never voted once during the two sessions f. the red. of any Estab. or Est., or f. the rep. of any taxes. He voted, however, f. Lord A. Hamilton on the Barons of Exch. in Scot. Voted ag. the Qu., and f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the rep. of the Malt tax. In 1819, voted f. the three millions of new taxes, and ag. any inquiry into the state of the nation; and f. the grant of the 10,000*l.* a year to the D. of York. It is a great treat to this young man to be shaken by the hand by the Archbishop of Canterbury. You may more often see him at the right hand side of the throne in the House of Lords next his Grace, looking dissatisfaction at Lord Grey during a debate, than in the House of Commons.

E. P. **Bastard.** Voted f. rep. of Malt tax: 3 times f. red. His name is not on Cath. Emanc. division; we believe he voted ag. the Bill. His name is not on any of the divisions on the Qu.'s case.

Ashburton. Sir J. **Copley.** *In Office.* Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.[1]

---

[1] Here we have "Contemtorque Deum Mezentius, et pius Æneas" all in one. Such a thorough want of public principle as this individual has manifested, it is painful, it is disgusting to contemplate.

Sir L. **PALK**. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the rep. of the Malt tax, and Husbandry Horse tax. Did not vote f. red. of any Estab. or Est. Voted ag. the Qu.

Barnstaple. Sir F. **OMANNEY**, M. **NOLAN**. Ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; f. Grant to D. of Clarence. Did not vote f. rep. of any taxes or red. of any Est. or Estab. Sir F. Omanney voted ag. Cath Emanc. Bill. Mr. Nolan's name does not appear on the division.

Beeralston. Lord **LOVAINE**. *In Office.* His name is not on the Cath. Emanc. division.

Hon. J. **PERCY**. Voted whenever he attended, with ministers. His name does not appear on the Cath. Emanc. division.

Dartmouth.—J. **BASTARD**,[1] C. M. **RICKETTS**. Voted ag. the Qu.; did not vote f. any red. of Est. or Estab. Mr. Ricketts opposed the rep. of Malt tax; and voted ag. Cath. Emanc.

Exeter. W. **COURTENAY**. Always voted for Ministers; for Cath. Emanc.

E. **NEWMAN**. Voted f. the Qu.; f. red,; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. Cath. Emanc.

Honiton. Hon. P. F. **CUST**, S. **CRAWLEY**. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; ag. red. or rep. of taxes. Mr. Crawley voted ag. Grant to the D. of Clarence. Mr. Cust did not. Mr. Crawley voted f. Select Committee on the conduct of the Sheriff of Dublin; and f. Mr. Hume's motion on Civil List Revenues. Mr. Cust did not.

Okehampton. **VISCOUNT GLENORCHY**. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu.; f. rep. of taxes, and red. of Est. and Estab.

LORD DUNALLY. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu.; did not vote f. any repeal of taxes or red. of Est. or Estab.

Plymouth. Sir W. **CONGREVE**, Sir B. **MARTIN**. *In Office.* Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.

Plympton. R. G. **MACDONALD**. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. the rep. of the Malt tax.

W. G. **PAXTON**. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the rep. of the Malt tax; Mr. R. G. Macdonald's name does not appear on the Cath. Emanc. division; Messrs. R. G. Macdonald and W. G. Paxton have not spent *very* much of their time in the House of Commons.

Sir J. S. Copley may be profligate enough—but he has a mind, and we have heard that it is not a very tranquil mind. We have reason to believe that "nocte dieque suum gestare in pectore testem" is a punishment to which even a Chief Justiceship in prospectu is a powerless antidote.

---

[1] Mr. Bastard's name does not appear in the Catholic Emancipation division.

Tiverton. Rt. Hon. R. Ryder. *In Office.* Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.

Lord Sandon. We believe has not attended during either of the Sessions.

Tavistock. Lord Ebrington; J. P. Grant. For Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu.; for rep. of taxes and red. of Est. and Estab. Lord E. voted ag. Grant to D. of Clarence. We do not find Mr. Grant's name on the divisions. Lord E. should attend more regularly. Mr. Grant is a very efficient member.

Totness. T. P. Courtenay.[1] *In Office.* Voted f. Cath. Emanc.

J. Bent. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. Grant to the D. of Clarence. Did not vote f. the Qu.; or f. red. of Est. or Estab.; or rep. of taxes.

---

[1] We regret that Mr. Brougham, in his speech on Monday, February 11, should have selected the case of Mr. T. P. Courtenay, the Secretary of the Board of Control, as an illustration of the extravagance of ministers. Was Mr. Brougham ignorant enough to believe that Mr. Courtenay's salary was charged to the country? or was he merely so pleased at the humorous representation suggested by a lively fancy, as to be indifferent to matter of fact when it interfered with a good joke? Whichever of these suppositions be true, it is fit and proper that the public should have a right knowledge both of the merits of the Hon. Secretary, and of the funds from which his allowances are drawn: And first of all of the merits of Mr. T. P. Courtenay. We are not party men, yet nevertheless we have, like other mortals, our prejudices and biases, and they lean, God knows, not to Mr. Courtenay's side of the House: but he has been unfairly dealt with, and, as we have the opportunity, we will avail ourselves of it, to do him justice. Mr. C. is one of the most able and efficient gentlemen that ever came into office, and we very much doubt whether his own party know how to appreciate either his talents or assiduity. He is a man "egregii altique silenti," which in these wordy days, these days of B. Bathurst and H. Twiss, is an attribute by no means recommendatory. He has been, unfortunately too, placed in an office which requires nearly double the application that is expected, or even necessary, in any other department of the State;* and which, notwithstanding, does not afford opportunities for the display of ability either to the cabinet or to the public. 2dly. Of the funds from which his allowances are drawn. Neither the Secretary, nor any branch of the Board of Control, is paid from the public purse. The E. India Company allow so much annually to defray the expenses of the Estab.; and Mr. Courtenay's salary, so far from being superfluously large, if considered in comparison with those of any other public Secretary, is very disproportioned to the greater amount of service rendered by him. Officers of inferior rank on the Estab. in Leadenhall Street, are paid nearly the same stipend, and the Secretary to the Court of Directors is paid more. If, however, Mr. Courtenay belonged to a Board chargeable to the public, we should say, it is not the 2,200*l.* a year of such conscientious servants as himself, that the country wish to see reduced. He is not overpaid.

* We do not except the Treasury, which, besides, has more than one Secretary.

DORSETSHIRE.

County. W. M. **Pitt.** Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc. ag. rep. of Malt tax; f. Grant to D. of Clarence. Never f. rep. of Taxes or Retrenchment.

T. B. **Portman.** Did not vote on Qu.'s case; voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence; f. rep. of Malt tax; f. Lord A. Hamilton's motion on Barons of Exchequer in Scotland; 3 times f. red.

Bridport. J. **Scott.** Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. Lord A. Hamilton's motion on Barons of Exchequer in Scotland; f. rep. of Malt tax. Never f. red.

Sir H. S. **Paul.** Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; ag. Cath. Emanc. Never f. a rep. of Taxes, or f. red.

Corfe Castle. H. **Bankes,** G. **Bankes.** Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; *always for Ministers,* except that Mr. H. Bankes voted f. Lord A. Hamilton's motion on Barons of Exchequer in Scotland; and once f. a small red. of the Army.

Dorchester. R. W. **Williams.** Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; ag. Cath. Emanc. Never f. red. (except on June 30, 1821) or rep. of Taxes.

C. **Warren.** *Placeman,* to all intents and purposes, and a notorious rat to boot; we believe did not vote on Cath. Question.

Lyme Regis. J. T. **Fane,** V. **Fane.** Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Never for red. or rep. of Taxes.

Milbourne Port. Sir E. **Paget,** Lord **Graves.** *In Office.* Did not vote, it would seem, on Cath. Emanc. Bill.

Poole. R. **Leycester.** Voted ag. grant to D. of Clarence; f. the Qu.; for Cath. Emanc.; twice f. red.; votes well; should attend oftener.

J. **Dent.** Does not appear to have attended on any question to which we refer, except to vote ag. Cath. Emanc.

Shaftesbury. A. **Moore.** We have been told has left the country, and will never come into parliament again.

R. **Leycester,** Jun. Did not attend, at least on any questions to which we refer.

Wareham. J. **Calcraft,** J. H. **Calcraft.** Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. red. and rep. of Taxes. J. Calcraft voted f. Grant to D. of Clarence. J. H. Calcraft should be more frequent in his attendance.

Weymouth, Melcombe Regis. Rt. Hon. M. T. **Wallace.** *In Office.* Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.

Weymouth. T. F. **Buxton.** Did not vote f. her Majesty's name to Liturgy; his name is not on Cath. Emanc. division; voted f. rep. of tax. and red.

M. Ure. Voted f. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. rep. of Malt tax; ag. Cath. Emanc. Never f. retrenchment or rep. of taxes.

W. Williams. Voted f. the Qu.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. rep. of Malt tax; one of Mr. Hume's phalanx. His name does not appear on Cath. Emanc. division.

DURHAM.

County. J. G. Lambton. It is unnecessary for us to say how this gentleman voted, except that he supported Cath. Emanc. Him and his noble spirited father-in-law (Earl Grey) we cannot over-praise. Mr. Lambton was ably supported in the fulfilment of his parliamentary duties, by his colleague the

Hon. W. Powlett, who also voted f. Cath. Emanc.; and f. the Qu. To detail more of Mr. Powlett's votes would be equally superfluous.

Durham. M. A. Taylor. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; and deserves equal praise f. correspondent exertions. He is the older member, but age has not slackened his zeal.

Sir H. Harding. Voted always f. ministers. Sir H. Harding, however, has some liberality in his disposition. He voted f. Cath. Emanc. What! in the ecclesiastical County of Durham, is there not one member to advocate the exclusion of the papists? Sir H. Harding may have no objection to passive obedience doctrines; he would, perhaps, back them on the sailor-like principle of saving trouble, but he is deaf to the church in danger cry. Long may he be so, and long may the bigotry of the priesthood have no other representative, than a verger or a sexton to prevent the cathedral bells from celebrating the birth of a whig heir.[1]

ESSEX.

County. C. C. Western. Voted f. the Qu.; for Cath. Emanc.; always f. rep. of taxes and retrenchment.

Adm. Sir E. Harvey. Voted, on all points, contrary to his colleague, a regular ultra-royalist. Never voted for retrenchment.

Colchester. J. B. Wildman. Voted f. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes or retrenchment.

H. Baring. Voted f. the Qu.; ag. grant to D. of Clarence; f. Cath. Emanc. we believe, though his name is not on the division. For retrenchment.

---

[1] It was one Dr. Haggitt who pointed out this *gentlemanly* way of giving vent to church spite, on the birth of an heir to Mr. Lambton.

Harwich. Rt. Hon. N. VANSITTART, Rt. Hon. B. BATHURST. *In Office.* Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.

Malden. B. GASKELL. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. grant to D. of Clarence; and very well on other motions whenever he attended.

J. H. STRUTT. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; ag. the Qu.; never f. rep. of taxes or retrenchment.

GLOUCESTERSHIRE.

County. Lord R. E. SOMERSET. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu. Never f. rep. of taxes or red.

Sir W. B. GUISE. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu.; and always f. retrenchment and rep. of taxes. Voted ag. Grant to D. of Clarence.

Cirencester. Lord APSLEY. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Never voted f. any rep. of taxes or red.

J. CRIPPS. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of Malt tax and husbandry horse tax. Did not vote f. the Qu., or f. any red.

Gloucester. E. WEBB. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence. Always f. rep. of taxes and retrenchment.

R. B. COOPER. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence. Never f. rep. of taxes or red.

Tewkesbury. J. E. DOWDESWELL. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of the Malt tax. Never f. any red. or rep. of taxes.

J. MARTIN. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; always voted f. rep. of taxes and retrenchment. Voted ag. Grant to the D. of Clarence. Constant in attendance.

HANTS.

County. J. P. JERVOISE. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu.; f. rep. of Malt tax; and rep. of Est. and Estab.

J. FLEMING. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; *once* f. economy on barrack agreement bill, and ag. Grant to D. of Clarence; unless J. Fleming, on both the lists, be the member for Saltash—non liquet, "which is which;" but let his constituents ask this Mr. Fleming the question. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or f. red.—See Saltash. Mr. Jervoise is an efficient member.

Andover. T. A. SMITH. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu. Did not vote f. rep. of any taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab.

Sir J. POLLEN. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu. Voted f. rep. of Malt tax, and f. Lord A. Hamilton's motion on Barons of Exch. in Scot. Did not vote f. red.

Christ Church. Sir C. H. ROSE. Has been, and is abroad.

S. BOURNE. *In Office.* Voted f. Cath. Emanc. A man whom Mr. Pitt nick-named, the Bishop of Hereford doats on, and parish officers curse. Mr. S. B. has not the violence of Mr. H. Sumner; but he is, nevertheless, not remarkable for the high polish of his manners.

Lymington. Sir H. NEALE. Voted ag. rep. of the Malt tax. His name does not appear on the Cath. question list. Did not vote f. the Qu., or rep. of taxes, or f. red.

W. MANNING. Voted f. Grant to the D. of Clarence; did not vote f. the Qu., or f. rep. of taxes, or f. red. Name does not appear on Cath. question list.

Newport. Sir L. W. HOLMES. Did not vote on any of the questions we refer to.

C. DUNCOMBE. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; never f. any retrenchment, or rep. of taxes. His name is not on Cath. question division.

Newton, otherwise Frankville. H. GURNEY. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu.; ag. Grant to the D. of Clarence. Did not vote f. any red. or rep. of taxes.

C. CAVENDISH. Voted f. rep. of Malt tax; and f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu. Did not vote f. any red. or rep. of taxes.

Petersfield. H. JOLLIFFE. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu. Did not vote f. any rep. of taxes, or red.

Sir P. MUSGRAVE. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu. Voted f. Mr. Gipps' motion of red. on the Ordnance Est.; f. no other red., or f. rep. of taxes.

Whitchurch. Hon. H. G. TOWNSEND, S. SCOTT. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Never f. rep. of taxes, or f. red.

Winchester. J. H. LEIGH. Voted f. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. rep. of Malt tax; ag. Cath. Emanc. He did not vote f. the Qu., or f. any rep. of taxes, or f. red.

P. St. JOHN MILDMAY. Voted f. the Qu., f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of taxes and red, of army, *once.* He votes well in general, but should support Mr. Hume.

Yarmouth. Sir P. POLE. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; ag. Cath. Emanc. Never f. any red. or rep. of taxes.

T. H. L. BROADHEAD. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu Never f. red. or rep. of taxes.

Portsmouth. J. CARTER. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. red.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence.

Adm. MARKHAM. Does not seem to have attended at all, during either of the sessions, certainly not to any purpose.

Southampton. W. CHAMBERLAYNE. Voted very well when he attended, but only divided on one of Mr. Hume's motions. Did not vote on the Qu.'s case, or on Cath. question.

Sir WM. DE CRESPIGNY. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu. Very frequently f. Mr. Hume's motions.

Stockbridge. J. F. BARHAM, J. F. BARHAM, Jun. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu.; f. red. and rep. of taxes.

HEREFORDSHIRE.

County. Sir J. COTTERELL. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc. Never voted f. any red. or rep. of taxes.

R. PRICE. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of taxes, and f. red. of Estab.

Hereford. Hon. J. S. COCKS. Voted ag. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc. Never f. red. of Estab., or rep. of taxes. Ag. the rep. of the Malt tax.

R. SCUDAMORE. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence; f. rep. of taxes, and red. of Estab.

Weobley. Lord F. C. BENTINCK. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or f. red.

Sir G. COCKBURN. *In Office.* His name is not on the Cath. Emanc. division.

HERTFORDSHIRE.

County. Sir J. S. SEBRIGHT.[1] Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. Grant to the D. of Clarence; f. red. of Est. and Estab., and f. rep. of taxes. Attends much better than his colleague:—but there is room enough for improvement.

Hon. W. LAMB. Voted ag. ministers in the Qu.'s case, but not f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc. Attends very little to his duty, we should say very seldom. But we learn that he was in bad health last session.—We hope he is recovered.

St. Albans. C. SMITH. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc. Never voted f. rep. of any taxes, nor f. red. of any Est. or Estab.

Sir H. WILSON. Do. do. do.

Hertford. N. CALVERT. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; rather ag.

---

[1] We confess ourselves to be prejudiced in favor of Sir J. S., and shall believe him to be a man of public integrity, till the contrary is shown. Of his colleague we have more than doubts; we fear there is little of the patriot in him: let the electors of Hertfordshire mind our words.

ministers than f. the Qu.; f. red. and economy; but he is too unfrequent in his attendance.

Visc. **CRANBORNE.** *In Office.* Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.

HUNTINGDONSHIRE.

County. W. H. **FELLOWES.** Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu.; f. rep. of Malt tax. Never f. red.; f. Lord. A. Hamilton's motion on Barons of Exch. in Scot.

Lord J. **RUSSELL.** Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu.; f. rep. of taxes, and f. red.

Huntingdon. Lord **ANCRAM.** Voted ag. rep. of Malt tax; f. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu. Never f. any red. or rep. of taxes.

J. **CALVERT.** *In Office.* Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.

KENT.

County. W. F. **HONEYWOOD.** Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence; frequently f. red. of Est. and Estab. and f. rep. of taxes.

Sir E. **KNATCHBULL.** Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Never voted f. red. of any Est. or Estab., or f. rep. of any taxes.—This gentleman, though a constant opposer of economy in any other shape, made the following speech, Jan. 26th, 1821; let the Agriculturists know their man. Mr. Denison moved, as usual, that a petition for the restoration of the Queen's name to the Liturgy, be printed. "Sir E. Knatchbull hoped, that on the score of economy, hon. gentlemen would not press the printing of every petition of this sort, that might be presented. He, therefore, hoped the hon. member would not persevere in his motion." Mr. Denison in reply. "Those from whom it came, though in a humble situation, were as much entitled to have their sentiments made known to their fellow subjects, as any other body of men could be." Lord Milton rose and said, "He was very glad to find the hon. member for Kent so alive to the necessity of enforcing the most rigid economy, and trusted the House and the Country would regard it only as an earnest of the zeal with which, for the future, the hon. member would labor for the reduction of every useless expense, and unnecessary office. Perhaps he might find that the office of Receiver General of the Land tax was one that might be dispensed with, under the present circumstances of the country, and the business connected with it, performed through some other channel. Should a motion to this effect be made, he hoped the country would be favored with the support of the hon. gentleman, who might, perhaps, be an important witness on this subject."

Canterbury. S. R. LUSHINGTON. *In Office.* Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.

Lord CLIFTON. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc. Lord C. votes well, but should attend oftener.

Dover. E. B. WILBRAHAM. Voted f. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc. Never f. any rep. of taxes, or red.

J. BUTTERWORTH. Voted ag. Grant to D. of Clarence; did not vote f. restoration of Qu.'s name to the Liturgy; did not vote f. censure of ministers f. their proceedings ag. Her Majesty. Never voted f. red. or rep. of any taxes. The electors of Dover might as well have sent a holder of office to Parliament; it was an odd choice they made.

Hythe. S. J. LLOYD. Voted ag. the Qu.; on no other question to which we refer.

S. MARJORIBANKS. Voted f. the Qu.; f. rep. of House and Window duties; and Malt tax; twice f. red.; f. Grant to D. of Clarence; f. Cath. Emanc.

Maidstone. A. W. ROBARTS. Voted f. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of taxes and red.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence. A. W. Robarts is one of the few that supported Mr. Hume constantly.—It would be well if his colleague were a better man.

J. WELLS. Voted ag. the Qu.; f. rep. of Malt tax; ag. Barrack agreement Bill; voted once f. red.; voted ag. Cath. Emanc., and ag. Grant to D. of Clarence.

Rochester. Lord BINNING. *In Office.* Voted f. Cath. Emanc.

R. BERNAL. One of the few really patriotic members who supported Mr. Hume; voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.

Romney. R. S. D. GROSVENOR, G. H. D. PENNANT. Voted ag. the Qu.; did not vote f. rep. of any taxes, or red. of any Est. or Estab. Mr. Grosvenor voted ag. Cath. Emanc. Mr. Pennant's name does not appear on the division of that question.

Queenborough. Rt. Hon. J. C. VILLIERS. *In Office.* Does not seem to have voted on Cath. Emanc. Bill.

G. P. HOLFORD. Voted f. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Did not vote f. rep. of any taxes, or f. the red. of any Est. or Estab.; ag. Cath. Emanc.

Sandwich. Sir G. WARRENDER. *In Office.* Voted f. Cath. Emanc.

J. MARRYAT. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Lord J. Russell's motion on Civil List; f. Mr. Brougham's motion on Droits of Admiralty; f. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Did not vote f. rep. of any taxes, or red. of any Est. or Estab.; f. Lord A. Hamilton's motion on Barons of Exch. in Scotland.

LANCASHIRE.

County. J. BLACKBURNE. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Never f. rep. of taxes or retrenchment.

Lord STANLEY. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of taxes or red.; f. the Qu. Votes well always, except when Lancashire magistrates, Lancashire yeomanry, or Lancashire gaolers are concerned. It is melancholy to see a man of his principles, degrading himself into the defender of such conduct!

Clitheroe. Hon. W. CUST, Hon. R. CURZON. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the rep. of Malt tax; never voted f. any rep. of taxes, or red. Hon. W. Cust voted on Grant to D. of Clarence.

Lancaster. Gen. DOVETON. Voted f. the Qu.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence; f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax.

F. W. CAWTHORNE. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of Husbandry Horse tax. Did not vote f. retrenchment at any time.

Liverpool. Rt. Hon. G. CANNING. *In Office.* Voted f. Cath. Emanc.

Gen. GASCOYNE. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu.; never voted f. any rep. of taxes or retrenchment.

Newton. T. LEIGH. Voted f. Lord A. Hamilton's motion on Barons of Exch. in Scot.; but on no other question to which we refer, *at least.*

T. CLAUGHTON. Voted f. rep. of Malt tax and Husbandry Horse tax; he voted ag. Cath. Emanc. Never in favor of retrenchment.

Preston. S. HORROCKS. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; never for red. or economy. We believe he voted ag. Cath. Emanc., but we do not find his name.

E. HORNBY. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of taxes and red. He might be at his post oftener, for he votes well.

LEICESTERSHIRE.

County. Lord R. MANNERS. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc. Never voted f. rep. of any taxes or red.

G. A. L. KECK. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. Lord A. Hamilton's motion on Barons of Exch. in Scot.; f. the rep. of the Malt tax; voted once for red. and ag. Grant to D. of Clarence.

Leicester City. J. **Mansfield.** Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc. Never voted f. any retrenchments, or rep. of taxes. An ultra-royalist.

T. **Pares.** Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of taxes and retrenchment.

LINCOLNSHIRE.

County. Hon. C. **Pelham.** Voted f. the Qu.; f. Lord A. Hamilton's motion on Barons of Exch. in Scotland; f. rep. of Malt tax; for Lord G. Russell's motion on Civil List. His name does not appear on division on Cath. Emanc. Did not vote f. any reductions.

C. **Chaplin.** Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Did not vote f. rep. of any taxes, or red.

Boston. G. J. **Heathcote.** Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu.; f. rep. of taxes and red.

Col. **Johnson.** Voted f. rep. of Malt tax, and Husbandry Horse tax; and f. red.; f. Cath. Emanc. Did not vote f. the Qu.

Grantham. Hon. E. **Cust.** Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; never voted f. any rep. of taxes or red.

Sir M. **Cholmeley.** Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; once f. red. on Ordnance Est.; ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; f. rep. of House and Window duties.

Great Grimsby. C. **Tennyson.** Voted f. Select Committees on conduct of Sheriffs of Dublin and Chester; f. rep. of Malt tax; f. red.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu.; voted ag. Grant to D. of Clarence.

W. **Duncomb.** Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Did not vote f. any rep. or red. His name does not appear on Cath. Emanc. division.

Lincoln. C. W. **Sibthorpe.** Voted ag. the Qu.; on no other questions to which we refer.

R. **Smith.** Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. red.

Stamford. Hon. H. **Percy,** Lord T. **Cecil.** Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc. Did not vote f. any rep. of taxes or red.

MIDDLESEX.

County. G. **Byng.** Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc. Voted ag. Grant to D. of Clarence; f. Mr. Hume's motion on Collection of Revenues; twice or three times for red.

S. C. **Whitbread.** Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence. One of Mr. Hume's phalanx.

London. Alderman **Wood.** Too deservedly esteemed for his zeal and perseverance, to need any praise of ours.—Voted f. Cath. Emanc.

T. WILSON. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu.; f. red.; f. Mr. Hume's motion on Civil List Revenues.

Sir W. CURTIS. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; always f. ministers: "tibi ingens virtus atque animus Cœnis responsat opimis."

G. BRYDGES. Voted always for ministers. His name is not on Cath. Emanc. division.—' Some men are born to have honors thrust on them!'

Westminster. Sir F. BURDETT. Voted for Cath. Emanc. If ever there was a valuable public character; if ever there was a member of the House of Commons without guile, he is such. A few years ago, in our simplicity, we used to repose confidence in the Whig party, but time, the greatest teacher next to death, has undeceived us, and we now know whom to suspect, and whom to trust.

Some one may urge, "Yet you have expressed your admiration of Mr. Lambton and Mr. Coke." "True, because they act up to their professions." "We are lovers of Whig principles." "But Sir Francis Burdett is a Tory," "Well, words do not alter the nature of things." They are "Hac re dissimiles ad cætera," agreed. It matters not that they start from opposite principles, if they arrive at the same conclusion. The best of English blood is in them, and we quarrel not with such Whigs, or such a Tory,—"O si sic omnes!"

J. C. HOBHOUSE.[1] Has voted, with scarce an exception, *on every division* of the least importance to the country, of course not on the side of ministers; f. Cath. Emanc. Par nobile fratrum.

NORFOLK.

County. T. W. COKE. Voted f. Cath. Emanc. His public character is so well known, that it is unnecessary to say more in his praise than that he has more of Whig principle than party spirit in him. This gentleman is above 70 years of age we believe, and has the merit of having opposed both the American and French wars.

E. WODEHOUSE. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu.; f. Lord A. Hamilton's motion on the Barons of Exch. in Scotland. Once f. red.; f. rep. of Malt tax.

It is said that taxation presses on the farmer at the rate of 3s. 6d. per acre, and argued by ministers and their supporters, that the expectation of any immediate relief by repeal of taxes is absurd, inasmuch as it would require a reduction of not less than five millions in the annual expenditure, to avail the farmers *at all;*—and why, we ask, absurd? Is the extravagance, because it serves as an entrenchment to a feeble administration, of so much greater importance, that the idea of an economy, by which it is not denied distress may be alleviated, is to be scouted? Is the country so satisfied of the immense advantages derived from the fostering care of their present superintendents, that, sooner than risk their removal, it will willingly reduce the agriculturists to indigence?

---

[1] Two of the most brilliant speeches ever heard in the House of Commons, were delivered by Mr. Hobhouse. The first on June 14th, 1820, against a standing army in time of peace; and the second on April 17th, 1821, in refutation of Mr. Canning's strictures on the reformers.

Mr. Gooch himself, Mr. S. Wortley, Sir T. Acland, and Mr. H. Sumner, whose pursuit, for years, has been the gratification of a childish personal vanity, in keeping ministers in, in spite of public dissatisfaction, will not go quite that length now; though as long as their own interests were not affected, they were agreed in preferring to back ministers, though at the expense of the rest of the community. Let the farmers remember this.—If one million only had been annually saved since the commencement of the peace, (which is seven years ago) and much, very much more might have been saved, their present situation would have been no otherwise distressing, than in a fair proportion with the commercial and other branches. Let them remember, too, that these ministerial agriculturists were not only content to resist the reduction of expenditure, but thought even the imposition of new taxes in time of peace, a trifling grievance to the country, when compared with the disadvantage of their party politics being frustrated. Let the farmers, above all, learn this lesson, that it is taxation, which should long ago have been diminished, and not the want of protecting duties, that is sending them to the poor-house. Let them have learned this lesson, and they will never again be so foolish as to entertain an indifference to the taxation of other branches of the community.

To return from general remarks to Mr. Wodehouse; we are not without hopes that he will detach himself from party, "Habemus confitentem reum." This Session will put his good principle to the test.—We expect that he will oppose any fresh taxation, and demand retrenchment to the utmost.

Castle Rising. Lord ROCKSAVAGE, Hon. F. HOWARD. Voted ag. rep. of Malt tax. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes or red. Lord R. voted ag. the Qu. His name does not appear on the Cath. Emanc. division. Hon. F. Howard voted f. Cath. Emanc., and did not vote on the Qu.'s case.

King's Lynn. Lord WALPOLE. With ministers always. His name is not on Cath. Emanc.

Member since dead.

Thetford. Lord **Fitzroy**, F. N. R. **Colborne**. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. red.; f. rep. of taxes. Mr. Colborne voted ag. the Grant to D. of Clarence.

Norwich. W. **Smith**. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence.

R. H. **Gurney**. Voted f. the Qu., and f. rep. of Malt tax; twice f. red. We believe that the ill health of near relations was the cause of his being very little at the house. He votes very well; always when he attends.

Yarmouth. C. E. **Rumbold**, Hon. G. **Anson**. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. retrenchment. C. Rumbold voted ag. Grant to D. of Clarence, and for rep. of Malt tax. Constant in their support of Mr. Hume.

NORTHAMPTONSHIRE.

County. W. R. **Cartwright**. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc. Never f. rep. of taxes or red.

Lord **Althorp**. Voted f. do. do. do. Neither of these members voted on Grant to D. of Clarence. Lord Althorp is a very attentive member.

Brackley. R. H. **Bradshaw**, H. **Wrottesley**. Voted ag. rep. of Malt tax; ag. the Qu. Never f. red. or rep. of taxes. Their names are not on division on Cath. Emanc. Bill. Mr. H. Wrottesley voted f. the Grant to the D. of Clarence. Mr. Bradshaw's name does not appear on the division on that question..

Higham Ferrers. Member since dead.

Northampton. Sir G. **Robinson**. Voted f. the Qu., and f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence. One of Mr. Hume's phalanx.

W. L. **Maberley**. *When he attended* voted with his colleague, "*verbum sat.*"

Peterborough. Sir R. **Heron**, J. **Scarlet**. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc. Gave Mr. Hume their aid very frequently. Sir R. Heron was *constant* in his attendance. J. Scarlet voted ag. the Grant to D. of Clarence.

NORTHUMBERLAND.

County. C. J. **Brandling**. Did not vote on the Qu.'s case. Never voted f. rep. of taxes or red.; f. Cath. Emanc.

P. W. **Beaumont**. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu.; f. rep. of taxes and red. Sir C. Monck is sadly wanted to support him. Mr. Brandling is a thick and thin ministerialist.

Berwick. Sir F. **Blake**. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu.; f. the Grant to the D. of Clarence; f. red. Voted f. Select Committees on conduct of Sheriffs of Dublin and Chester.

Lord **Ossulston.** Voted f. the Qu. This member's name does not appear on the divisions on the Cath. Emanc. Voted f. red. and rep. of taxes.

Newcastle on Tyne. Sir M. W. **Ridley.** Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the rep. of taxes and red. Did not vote on the Qu.'s case.

C. **Ellison.** Voted f. restoration of Qu.'s name in the Liturgy, but f. ministers on the Question of Censure. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes or red. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax.

Morpeth. W. **Ord.** Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. retrenchment; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence; f. rep. of taxes.

Rt. Hon. W. **Howard.** Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; once f. red.

NOTTINGHAMSHIRE.

County. Lord W. **Bentinck.** Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu. Did not vote f. red. of any Est. or Estab. Voted f. rep. of Malt tax; f. Mr. Brougham's motion on Droits of Admiralty.

Adm. **Sotheron.** Ag. the Qu. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes or f. red. His name is not on Cath. Emanc.

Newark. Sir W. H. **Clinton.** Voted ag. rep. of Malt tax; ag. Cath. Emanc. Does not seem to have voted on the Qu.'s case. Never voted f. red. or rep. of taxes.

H. **Willoughby.** Did not vote on any of the questions to which we refer, if he ever attended.

Nottingham. T. **Denman.** Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of taxes, and red. of Est. and Estab.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence.

J. **Birch.** For the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of taxes, and red. of Est. and Estab.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence. Both these gentlemen perform their duties most exemplarily; they are constant in their attendance.

Retford. W. **Evans.** Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence; f. red. and rep. of House and Window duties.

S. **Crompton.** Do., do., do.; except that we do not find his name on minority ag. Grant to D. of Clarence. Each of these members voted constantly with Mr. Hume.

OXFORDSHIRE.

County. J. **Fane.** Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu.; ag. Grant to the D. of Clarence; f. Lord A. Hamilton's motion on Barons of Exch. in Scot.; f. rep. of Malt tax. Did not vote f. the rep. of the Husbandry Horse tax on 1st division; ag. red. of

Army Est. and Estab.; ag. compensation to Clerks of Scotch Admiralty.

W. Ashurst. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu.; f. the Grant to D. of Clarence. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab.

Banbury. Hon. H. Legge. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab. Did not vote f. the Qu.

Woodstock. J. H. Langston.[1] Voted f. the Qu.; f. red.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. Cath. Emanc.

J. Gladstone. Voted f. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. rep. of Malt tax; f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu. Never f. rep. of taxes, or f. red.

Oxford City. J. J. Lockhart. Voted f. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. the rep. of Husbandry Horse tax, Malt tax, and occasionally f. the red. of Est. and Estab.; voted ag. Grant to D. of Clarence.

C. Wetherell. F. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc. Did not vote f. the rep. of taxes, or the red. of any Est. or Estab.

Oxford University. Rt. Hon. Robert Peel. Ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu.; f. Grant to D. of Clarence. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab.; ag. rep. of Husbandry Horse tax, and Malt tax.

R. Heber. New member.

RUTLANDSHIRE.

County. Sir G. Noel, Bart. Voted f. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or f. red.

Sir G. Heathcote. Voted f. the Qu.; his name is not on Cath. Emanc. division. Did not vote f. red.; voted f. rep. of Malt tax.

SHROPSHIRE.

County. J. K. Powell. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab.

R. Hill. Perhaps he never attended; we have not met with his name on any of the questions to which we refer.

Bishop's Castle. W. Holmes. *In Office.* Voted ag. Cath. Emanc. "*Το δε οργανον,—αψυχος δουλος.*"

---

[1] We have been given to understand, that when this gentleman entered the House he was disposed to side with ministers. He is therefore the more highly to be praised, for having sacrificed his prejudices, instead of obstinately resisting the convictions forced on him by nearer acquaintance with their principles and conduct.

E. **Rogers.** Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of Malt tax; once f. red. of Army on Mr. Macdonald's motion.

Bridgenorth. T. **Whitmore.** Ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab.

W. W. **Whitmore.** Voted vice versâ to his colleague on every subject.

Ludlow. Lord **Clive**, Hon. R. **Clive.** Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab.

Shrewsbury. Hon. H. G. **Bennett.** A most exemplary member; one of Mr. Hume's phalanx. Voted f. Cath. Emanc. *He never* was absent from his duty. Voted ag. Grant to D. of Clarence.

P. **Corbett.** Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of Malt tax; f. red.; f. Mr. Hume's motion on Collection of Revenue.

Wenlock. C. W. **Forester.** Voted f. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Did not vote f. the Qu.; nor f. rep. of taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab. His name is not on Cath. Emanc. division.

W. L. **Childe.** Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab.

SOMERSETSHIRE.

County. W. **Dickinson.** Voted ag. ministers, rather than f. the Qu.; voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of Malt tax; voted on one motion f. red.

Sir T. **Lethbridge.**[1] Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of Malt tax; f. Mr. Chetwynd's motion for Economy; did not vote f. red. Both these members attend very ill; the public can afford to lose the latter's services; he is an ultra-royalist. But

---

[1] Since we have made the above remarks, Parliament has met, and Sir T. Lethbridge has verified our prophecy; he has become, all of a sudden, clear-sighted; he has put on record his opinion, that Ministers "*are entirely ignorant of the state of the country.*" Sir T. L. was so convinced at last of this truth, that he could not even wait over the first day of the Session before he published it to the country. Mr. Curteis, of Sussex, has very cooly reiterated, and in even more decided language, his assurance that he had voted for retrenchment. At the Sussex Meeting, Mr. C. said,—"he had not been fastidious in his opposition to Ministers; he has now boldly stated that "he had voted for *every* measure of public economy." We entreat his constituents to ask him on what *one* occasion he ever thus voted? On what *one* occasion we say? He cannot pretend to say that, voting for the repeal of two taxes that affected his own interests, and not voting for any retrenchment in the supplies called for by Ministers, was being an advocate of public economy: yet such was his mode of proceeding.

Mr. *Dickinson's* principles are believed to be those of a patriotic English gentleman. Let him illustrate them a little more, by fulfilling the duties of a representative. When he is in his place he votes well, except when the characters or conduct of Somersetshire magistrates, or Somersetshire goalers, is in question. We have heard, since writing thus slightingly of Sir T. Lethbridge, that he has not received any rent for a long time, that he has had *some* poor's rates to pay, and that his hair is absolutely "standing on end." This gives us hopes of him. He will now, perhaps, turn patriot.—*'Α Πενία Διόφαντε μόνα* * * * *ἐγείρει.*

Bath. Lord J. **Thynne**. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab.

Col. **Palmer**. Voted f. a Select Committee on Irish 10 per cent. duties; f. the Qu.; twice f. red. of Ordnance Est.; f. Lord A. Hamilton's motion on Barons of Exch. in Scot.; f. Lord J. Russell's motion on Civil List Resolutions; f. rep. of Malt tax. His name does not appear on the divisions on Cath. Emanc. bill. Lord Stowell would not every where meet with a person of so forgiving a disposition as Col. Palmer. That his Lordship, when Sir W. Scott, should have envied Mr. W. Holmes his appointment, has been reasonable matter of surprise to every one; we fear that his conduct, on the occasion to which we allude, was not quite gentlemanly, and almost unconstitutional.

Bridgewater. W. **Astell**. Voted f. Mr. Brougham's motion on Droits of Admiralty; once f. a red. of the Miscellaneous Est.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; f. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. Cath. Emanc. Never f. rep. of taxes.

C. A. **Tynte**. Voted f. Mr. Hume's motion on Collection of Revenues; f. rep. of Malt tax; voted 3 times f. red. His name is not on the division on Cath. Emanc. Voted ag. ministers rather than f. the Qu. on Qu.'s case.

Bristol. R. H. **Davis**. Did not vote f. the Qu. He does not seem to have voted during either session (query whether he ever attended) except in support of the Grant to D. of Clarence, and ag. rep. of Malt tax.

H. **Bright**. An excellent member—one of Mr. Hume's phalanx. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence.

Ilchester. Sir I. **Coffin**. Voted f. red.; f. the Qu.; f. rep. of Malt tax; f. Cath. Emanc. The only objectionable vote he gave was in favor of the Grant to D. of Clarence.

Dr. **Lushington**. It is unnecessary to say any thing in praise of Dr. Lushington,—he voted f. Cath. Emanc. He is a man of staunch integrity.

Minehead, H. F. **Luttrell**, J. F. **Luttrell**. Voted ag.

the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes or red. J. F. Luttrell voted ag. rep. of Malt tax.

Taunton. A. BARING.[1] Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Read speech of Mr. Baring subjoined in note.

J. A. WARRE. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of Malt tax, and House and Window duties; f. red.

Wells. C. W. TAYLOR. Voted f. Mr. Brougham's motion on Droits of Admiralty; f. Lord J. Russell's motion on Civil List; f. the Qu. We do not find his name on any other division to which we refer.

J. P. TUDWAY. We have met with no evidence of this gentleman's having attended at all, during either of the sessions.

STAFFORDSHIRE.

County. E. J. LITTLETON. Voted ag. the Qu.; f. rep. of Malt tax; f. Mr. Hume's motion on the Collection of Revenues. His name does not appear on the Cath. Emanc. division. Never voted f. red.

Sir J. F. BOUGHEY. Voted f. the Qu. His name does not appear on the Cath. Emanc. division.—One of Mr. Hume's phalanx.

Litchfield. Sir G. ANSON. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. Barrack Agreement Bill: and very well when he attended, which was, it would seem, only on three or four great questions.

G. V. VERNON. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; f. Cath. Emanc. Never f. rep. of taxes, or f. red.

---

[1] Extract from speech of Mr. Baring, against repeal of Malt tax, June 14th, 1821.—"Mr. Baring rose chiefly to advert to the conduct of three honorable Members, (Mr. Gipps, Mr. Gooch, and Mr. Davenport) who commonly supported Ministers, and who now advocated the repeal of this Tax. He, Mr. Baring, *had voted for every retrenchment proposed in the supplies*, but not having been successful in a single instance, he did not feel it to be his duty, in the situation of the country, *and after such extravagant* supplies had been voted, to weaken the revenue, by voting for the repeal of the Tax. He could not conceal his astonishment that Gentlemen like the Honorable Member for Suffolk, Mr. Gooch, should expect to return with a good grace to their Constituents, after having supported every extravagance, by merely voting for the repeal of a tax that affected their own interests particularly. As to the various items of the estimates, those Honorable Gentlemen had not voted in one instance with the Honorable Member for Aberdeen, who, however, at last, had obtained the admiration of Mr. Gooch. When they should explain to their Constituents, that they had not thought it their duty to support *any one* retrenchment proposed, he knew not how they would be able to satisfy them of the consistency of their conduct."

Newcastle-under-Line. W. S. KINNERSLY. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Never f. rep. of taxes, or f. red.

R. WILMOT. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu. Never f. rep. of taxes, or f. red.

Stafford. B. BENYON. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc. One of Mr. Hume's phalanx. Ag. Grant to D. of Clarence.

G. CHETWYND. Voted ag. the Qu.; frequently on motions of Messrs. Bennet, Hume, and Creevey; moved a resolution f. retrenchment. His name does not appear on Cath. Emanc. division.

Tamworth. Lord TOWNSEND. Voted f. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of taxes and red.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence.

W. Y. PEEL. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. Lord A. Hamilton's motion on Barons of Exch. in Scot.; once ag. ministers on Qu.'s case, but not f. the Qu. Never f. rep. of taxes, or red.; f. Grant to D. of Clarence.

SUFFOLK.

County. T. S. GOOCH. Voted ag. the Qu.; never f. any red. of Est. or Estab. We believe he voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; but his name does not appear on the division. He voted f. rep. of Malt tax: and though he sided with ministers, and did not support the FIRST division f. rep. of the Agricultural Horse tax, yet he was constrained to turn round and vote for it on the SECOND division.

This gentleman, whom the disappointed Agriculturists dubbed Gaffer Gooch, (an appellation coarse and contemptuos enough to be sure,) when Chairman of the Committee on Agricultural Distress, was made the dupe of Lord Londonderry, whom he, simple bargainer, had thought his sure friend. Yet Lord L. did nothing more than any other minister would have done in his place. "Mais le pauvre Gooch," as the Vice-Chancellor would say. He had, in common with the other ministerial Agriculturists, for years been opposing enquiry into the distress of other branches of the community: he had, in common with the aforesaid gentlemen, supported many extravagant Grants, and every extravagant Estimate, in the fond hope of favor and protection whenever he might stand in need of either; yet when he requires both, the noble Lord, after a dissimulation that added insult to the denial, abjures all partiality, and looks at things only in the abstract. Now might you see the influence of circumstances on human mind. "Le pauvre Gooch." He no sooner discovers that he has been made a fool of, than (like a young lady who has been trifled with by her lover,) he hastens to vindicate his outraged dignity, and by way of having his spite out, as we used to say at school, selects from Lord Londonderry's rivals, him[1] whom he is well aware it would most gall his Lordship to hear praised, and publicly professes his admiration of him.[2]

We had written thus far when the account of the Suffolk County Meeting was brought us. Mr. Gooch spoke, and is reported to have promised, "*without derogation to the principles he had always supported,* to stand up in Parliament as the advocate of Economy and Retrenchment." Why, the principles he has always supported are Taxation and Expenditure ad libitum; to such equivoques are those persons driven who have not manliness enough to confess their errors—we hope he has resolution to amend them; but we have too good reason to doubt. He will, of course, oppose a Malt tax, for it requires no public principle to urge him to that, "sua res agitur." While the whole country, except the Agriculturists, were suffering, he cared not; he even voted that they should pay an additional three millions by way of punishment for complaining. But when the Landholders began to be a little pinched in turn, then "quis iniquæ tam patiens sortis tam ferreus ut teneat se," then Taxes are "most *odious,* most *oppressive,* and most *unjust.*" We suspect he will only aim at shifting the pressure from his own shoulders; and we should not be at all astonished to find him supporting a property tax. At the end of last session he made a foolish speech about "all the blood of all the Cavendishes," and that he would never change sides. Blood has nothing to do with the question, and he may take our assurance for voucher, that the country do not care one straw on which side of the House he sits, provided that he votes for Retrenchment, and above all, against the continuance of an enormous Army in time of peace, which, (exclusive of any other objections that Mr. Gooch, being old womanish, is not pervious to,) swallows up, of itself only, millions annually. But we fear "*Νεκρον ιατρευειν και γεροντα νουθετειν τ' αυτ' εστι.*"

W. ROWLEY. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu.; always in favor of rep. of taxes and red.

Aldeburgh. J. WALKER, J. BLAIR. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the rep. of Malt tax. Did not vote f. red. of Est. or Estab., or f. rep. of taxes.

Dunwich. Col. M. BARNE. Voted ag. the Qu. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab.

---

[1] Mr. Hume.

[2] Mr. Gooch voted, in 1819, for the three million of new taxes, and for the Grant to the Duke of York of 10,000*l.* a year.

G. H. CHERRY. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. the rep. of Malt tax. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab. Voted ag. Grant to D. of Clarence. Neither of these members' names appear on the Cath. Emanc. division.

St. Edmunsbury. Hon. A. P. UPTON. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or red. of any Est. or Estab.

Lord J. FITZROY. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of Malt tax. Did not vote f. any red. of Est. or Estab.

Eye. Sir R. GIFFORD. *In Office.* Voted ag. Cath. Emanc. Yet he is reported to be no bigot, but to have ratted to the doctrines of the Established Church. Reports very often originate in personal hatred or envy; we therefore ask him—was he ever a Whig or a Unitarian?

Sir R. G. will have no reason to complain of us—on the contrary, we shall have done him a great service in thus bringing into a contradictible shape, a rumor widely spread, generally credited, and of long standing. If we had had the disposition to slander him we could easily have copied a form from a weekly paper, which would have insinuated as much, yet have been ingeniously guarded against the access of refutation.

Sir M. NIGHTINGALE. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of Malt tax. Never f. red.

Ipswich. T. B. LENNARD, W. HALDIMAND. Very valuable representatives. Voted f. the Qu.; f. rep. of taxes and red.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence. Mr. Lennard voted f. Cath. Emanc. His colleague's name does not appear on the division.

Orford. E. A. M'NAGTEN. *In Office.* Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.

Lord LONDONDERRY. Voted f. Cath. Emanc. Said of the people of England some few years back, that "they exhibited an ignorant impatience of taxation;" and of the Agricultural interest, last year, that "it was in a state of repose."

When the Noble Lord "*ανεισι λοξων ες διεξοδους επων*," we confess that we are always infinitely more struck by his manner than even his language. His demeanor towards his opponent, his mode of contention, as well as his choice of phrases, has a "curiosa felicitas." He seems as if he felt what it would be bad taste to profess, but not bad policy to signify——his sense of superiority.

> "Iste tulit pretium jam nunc certaminis hujus,
> "Qui cum victus erit mecum certasse feretur."

He seems as if he felt that certainty of success which inspires contempt for reasoning, and as if he rose more for the display of condescension, than the removal of objections to his measures.

Sudbury. Alderman **HEYGATE.**[1] Voted ag. the Qu.; f. Lord J. Russell's motion on Civil List Resolutions; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes. Voted once f. a small red.

C. A. **TULK.** Voted f. Lord A. Hamilton's motion on Barons of Exch. in Scot.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu.; f. Mr. Hume's motion on Collection of Revenues. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes. Voted f. Grant to D. of Clarence. Voted 3 times f. red.

SURREY.

County. W. J. **DENISON.** Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc. One of Mr. Hume's phalanx.

G. H. **SUMNER.** As much the reverse of his colleague as possible. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc. Did not vote f. rep. of any tax, or f. any red.

The gentlemanly behaviour of this member towards Mr. Alderman Wood last Session, will not soon be forgotten. That rash man, Lord Nugent, was the only person who ventured to reprehend him for it; the rest of the Honorable House, even their excellent Speaker, seemed too frightened to interfere. To be sure, a man who pelts pewter ink-stands at your head, is not the sort of person to call to order;[2] but might he not be taught good manners by the Serjeant at Arms? If we were members, we certainly would not serve on Committees with any one so void of gentlemanly notions, unless the well-fed Sir W. Curtis, or the amiable Mr. M. Dawson, were named with us, and would permit us to sit under their sides.

Bletchingley. Marq. of **TITCHFIELD.** Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu. Does not appear to have voted on any other questions to which we refer. This Nobleman is a promising Representative.

Hon. E. H. **EDWARDS.** Does not seem to have attended during either of the Sessions, at least, "nulla vestigia."

Gatton. J. W. **RUSSELL.** Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; and always f. ministers.

T. **DIVETT.** Voted f. the Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. the rep.

---

[1] This enlightened alderman fancies himself "mighty clever." He is what we call a political coxcomb, or pedant, if you think coxcomb too young a term for a man who wears spectacles. Lord Ellenborough, in the other House, is of his school.

[2] The House will pardon us for throwing out this suggestion. No offence is meant; "we fear their vengeance and respect their power." Doubtless we are guilty of great presumption in even alluding to the mysteries of their self-regulating discipline. But surely they will not be extreme to mark what is said amiss.

of the Malt tax; ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc. Did not ever vote f. rep. of taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab.

Guilford. A. ONSLOW. Voted f. the Qu.'s name to Liturgy, but ag. the motion f. censure of ministers f. their proceedings ag. her Majesty; f. Lord A. Hamilton's motion on Barons of Exch. in Scot.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Never voted f. any rep. of taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab.

C. B. WALL. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab.

Haslemere. Rt. Hon. Sir C. LONG, R. WARD. *In Office.* Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.

Ryegate. Hon. J. S. COCKS. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; ag. the Qu. Never f. rep. of taxes, or f. red.

Sir J. YORKE. Voted ag. rep. of Malt tax; does not seem to have voted on Qu.'s case. Voted frequently f. red. Promised not to vote f. arrears to D. of Clarence; but we do not find his name on any of the minorities on the question.

Southwark. C. CALVERT, Sir R. WILSON.[1] Voted f. Cath. Emanc. Any further account of their votes would be superfluous: they are both invaluable Representatives.

SUSSEX.

County. W. BURRELL. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Grant to the D. of Clarence; ag. the Qu.; f. the rep. of Malt tax, and Agricultural Horse tax; not once f. Retrenchment. Yet, on 14th of June, 1821, he made a most extraordinary speech against ministers, which we subjoin in a note.[2] When taxes began to press upon the landed interest in which he was concerned, he felt for the country—what had he been doing since 1815; this is the seventh year of peace?

---

[1] The "fine feeling" that pervades Royal breasts has been strikingly manifested in the treatment of Sir R. Wilson. He voted for the Grant of the arrears to the Duke of Clarence, and by so doing incurred considerable dissatisfaction and reproach. It was an error in Sir R. to vote as he did. But there was virtue in the very weakness; there was a heart in the very vote that was reprehended. His Majesty, bearing in mind this amiableness of Sir R. W., takes the first opportunity that presents itself, to mark the sense he entertains of the gallant General's conduct, and rewards him—by reducing him to poverty. Thus, then, stands the case between the King and Sir R. W.—the latter votes for an increase to the income of the former's brother, the former, out of gratitude, takes what Sir R. has to live on, from him. But it will be said, you forget the part taken by Sir R. W. in favor of the Queen. True, the King then has magnanimity well proportioned to his gratitude. His Majesty too, was aware that Sir R. W. did not support the Queen's interest on any private grounds, but merely fulfilled what he conceived to be his public duty.

[2] Extracts from Mr. W. Burrell's speech—"It had been said by the minister, only enable us to go on with the war, and you will be relieved when a peace can be obtained. Yet to this day they paid the same taxes as in time of war, all but the Property tax, (which the opposition forced from minis-

J. E. CURTEIS. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of Malt tax, and Husbandry Horse tax; f. the Grant to the D. of Clarence; ag. the Qu. This member certainly has not been "*fastidious*" in his opposition to ministers. His name does not appear on any division in favor of Economy or Retrenchments. We fear he is one of those men who would not scruple to relieve agriculture at the expense of the rest of the community. But let him be advised, such attempts would be dishonest—and honesty is the best policy; hugging Mr. Cobbett as the agriculturist's friend one day, and quibbling himself out of the hug, in a letter to the Courier, a few days after, are inconsistencies that grew out of his political position. Let him change that position: let him support measures of *general* benefit, and he will have done all that can be done to improve the situation of the Landed Interest.

Arundel. R. BLAKE. Voted ag. the Qu.; f. rep. of Malt tax. His name does not appear on Cath. Emanc. division. Did not vote f. red. of any Est. or Estab.

Lord BURY. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of taxes, and red. of Est. and Estab.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence.

Bramber. J. IRVING. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc. Never voted f. rep. of any taxes, or red. of any Est. or Estab. Voted f. Grant to D. of Clarence.

W. WILBERFORCE. Voted f. Qu.'s name to the Liturgy, yet, voted ag. censure of ministers f. their proceedings ag. her Majesty. Voted f. the rep. of Malt tax;[1] voted once f. a small red. of Army; voted f. Cath. Emanc. Did not vote ag. the Grant to D. of Clarence. The world is so entirely at a loss to make you out, Mr. Wilberforce, that we are quite sure that a pamphlet entitled "An Attempt to discover what Mr. Wilberforce is," would have a rapid sale; and, if we thought we could eventually arrive at any safe or reasonable conclusion, we would immediately set about writing one ourselves. But he will be a bold man, in our mind, who shall aim at unravelling such a mystery. We are only satisfied of this one thing, viz. that he is chiefly made up of cant. But then he cants with such a vicissitude of variety, (as Mr. Canning would

---

ters,) and that tax they would soon have again. Had there been any relief afforded to the country? What advantage had it derived from the peace? Had any deduction been made this year? He stated, from firm conviction, that it was impossible for things to go on as they were—*The taxes had risen to an amount that would prove the absolute ruin of the country.*"

[1] He voted for the imposition of the three millions of new Taxes, and for the Grant of 10,000l. a year to the Duke of York, in 1819; and once by mistake that year, voted on the right side, but asked and obtained leave to vote over again.

say) sometimes to one tune and sometimes to another, that this conviction does not help us a jot in our enquiry. We understand Mr. Buxton perfectly well—he is a consistent man; Mr. L. Keck deals in fewer professions, and is infinitely more bearable,—but really, Mr. Wilberforce, should you die to-morrow, we should say, "It is well,—pray do not drop your mantle in your flight Heavenwards."[1]

Chichester. Rt. Hon. W. Huskisson. *In Office*. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.

Lord G. Lennox. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab. Voted ag. rep. of Malt tax.

Grinstead, East. Lord Strathaven, Hon. C. Jenkinson. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab.

Hastings. J. Dawkins, Hon. J. W. Scott. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab. Hon. J. W. Scott. voted ag. Cath. Emanc., and f. Grant to D. of Clarence. J. Dawkins' name does not appear on the divisions on either of these subjects.

Horsham. R. Hurst. Voted once f. red. of Army; f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of Malt tax.

---

[1] We are speaking of Mr. Wilberforce's public character only.—His meritorious exertions to put a stop to the slave trade, are, nevertheless, remembered to his honor. But one brilliant action will not redeem a life of mischief. His example and declamations have been morally and politically most injurious to his country; this may seem a bold assumtion, but the abuse of the best things is the most prejudicial, and he who distorts Religion as he has done, cannot fail to demoralize the nation where it is established. He has nearly pulled down a sober faith to enthrone cant; and we shrink not from avowing our firm belief, that in after times, he will be better known by the title of Restorer of Puritanism, than that of Abolisher of the Slave Trade.

Mr. Wilberforce is in the habit of hurling at Mr. Tierney, on every available opportunity, the epithet of party man. "Eheu Quam temere in nosmet legem sancimus iniquam!" The only difference between him and Mr. T. is this, Mr. T. professes himself to be what he is, and Mr. W. does not. Let any one read Mr. Wilberforce's letter to Talleyrand, in which he shamelessly strives to give to Mr. Pitt the glory so nobly earned by his rival; the latter he refers to incidentally, as a zealous co-operator with his friend the Heaven-born Pilot. Co-operator!! He might with as much justice designate Achilles as the co-operator of Patroclus. Yet C. J. Fox was the very achiever of the triumph for which Mr. Wilberforce had indeed fought, but towards which Mr. Pitt had been contented to contribute only the heartless aid of a single speech.

Let any one read Mr. W.'s speech, and mark the vote that followed his speech on the Peace of 1814; let any one call to mind his motion on the Queen's question, in 1820, and he will not ask for fresh testimonies of Mr. Wilberforce's being a party man.

Sir J. AUBREY, Bart. A long tried and consistent friend to Liberty. This gentleman is 80 years of age, and consequently cannot attend so constantly as he has done. He has the merit of having opposed both the American and French war, and Mr. Pitt's and the present Ministry's *gagging* bills. Voted f. the Qu.; and whenever he was able to attend, f. retrenchment and ag. a standing Army. We believe he is the "Father of the House of Commons." Such a man

> "Claims a reverence in his shortening day
> That 'tis an honor and a joy to pay."

Lewes. Sir J. SHELLEY, Bart. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; did not vote f. the Qu., or f. any retrenchments; voted f. rep. of House and Window duties, Husbandry Horse tax, and Malt tax.

Sir. G. SHIFFNER. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc. Never voted f. rep. of taxes, or red. of Estab.

Midhurst. A. SMITH, J. SMITH. Voted ag. rep. of Malt tax; voted ag. Grant to D. of Clarence; f. red. of Est.; f. Cath. Emanc., both we believe, though only Mr. J. Smith's name is on the list.

Rye. P. BROWN. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of the Malt tax. Never voted f. retrenchment, or rep. of taxes; f. Cath. Emanc.

J. DODSON. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of the Malt tax; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. Grant to D. of Clarence. Never voted f. retrenchment, or rep. of taxes.

Seaford. Hon. G. W. ELLIS. Voted f. the Qu.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. rep. of Malt tax; f. Cath. Emanc. Never voted f. rep. of taxes, or red.

C. R. ELLIS. Voted ag. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Never voted f. rep. of taxes or red.

Shoreham. Sir C. BURRELL. Voted f. rep. of Husbandry Horse tax; f. Lord A. Hamilton's motion on Barons of Exch. in Scot.; ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc. Never voted f. any red. of Expenditure.

J. M. LLOYD. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of taxes, and red.

Steyning. G. R. PHILLIPS. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. red. twice. Votes well, but does not attend often enough.

Lord H. J. K. HOWARD. His name is not on any divisions to which we refer—nor do we see reason for believing that he *ever* attended during either of the Sessions.

Winchelsea. H. BROUGHAM, L. CONCANNON. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu.;[1] f. red.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence;

---

[1] Mr. Brougham, Mr. Maxwell, Mr. H. Baring, and others, did not vote for the repeal of taxes, but always strenuously endeavoured to enforce re-

very excellent members. Mr. Brougham's Speech on Droits of Admiralty (May 5, 1820,) is unanswerable: he exerted himself very meritoriously to procure a diminution of the Civil List Grant in 1820, and unintermittingly supported Mr. Hume (as did also his colleague) during the whole of last Session. The Electors of Westmorland will be fortunate if they can rescue themselves from their present thraldom, to secure such a man for their representative.

WARWICKSHIRE.

County. D. S. **Dugdale.** Voted ag. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. rep. of Malt tax; ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc. Never f. rep. of taxes or red.

F. **Lawley.** Did not vote f. her Majesty's name to Liturgy. Voted f. rep. of Husbandry Horse tax; ag. rep. of Malt tax; f. Cath. Emanc. Never f. red. of Est. or Estab.; f. Select Committee on conduct of Sheriff of Dublin.

Coventry. P. **Moore,** G. **Ellice.** Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of taxes and red.; P. Moore, voted ag. Grant to D. of Clarence.

Warwick. Sir C. **Greville.** Voted ag. rep. of Malt tax; ag. Cath. Emanc. Never f. rep. of taxes or red. of Est. or Estab. Did not vote f. the Qu.

C. **Mills.** Voted ag. rep. of the Malt tax; ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc. Never f. rep. of taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab.

WESTMORELAND.

County. Viscount **Lowther,** Hon. H. C. **Lowther.** Invariably voted with ministers; ag. Cath. Emanc.

Appleby. A. J. **Dalrymple.** Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab.

T. **Creevey.** Voted f. Cath. Emanc. It is unnecessary to say how Mr. Creevey voted on other matters; his conduct is appreciated—he has his reward. He and Mr. Hume are the Castor and Pollux of the political arena. We recommend Mr. Creevey's speech on Committee of Supply (April 6, 1821,) to general attention. His Pamphlets, entitled "Guide to the Electors of Great Britain," and "Remarks on the last Session of Parliament," published by Ridgway, do him great credit, and should be read by all

trenchment. Voting for the repeal of a tax sounds very imposingly, but really is far, very far, from indicative of opposition to the extravagant demands of ministers.

who wish to know the composition and conduct of that body which Mr. Canning praised for "working well."

WILTS.

County. J. BENETT. Voted f. the Qu.; f. rep. of Malt tax, and Husbandry Horse tax; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence; f. Cath. Emanc. A very valuable member. F. retrenchment always.

J. D. ASTLEY. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. only of Malt tax; never f. retrenchment.

Bedwin. Rt. Hon. Sir J. NICHOLL, J. J. BUXTON. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab. J. J. Buxton voted ag. rep. of Malt tax.

Calne. Hon. J. ABERCROMBY, J. MACDONALD. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of taxes, and red. of Est. and Estab.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence.

Chippenham. W. A. MADDOCKS. Voted f. Mr. Brougham's motion on Droits of Admiralty; voted f. the Qu.; did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab. His name does not appear on the division on Cath. Emanc. Bill.

J. R. GROSSET. Voted f. Mr. Brougham's motion on Droits of Admiralty; voted f. the Qu.; did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab. His name does not appear on division on Cath. Emanc. Bill.

Cricklade. J. PITT. Voted f. rep. of Malt tax, and Husbandry Horse tax; ag. the Qu.; did not vote f. red. of Est. or Estab.; voted ag. Cath. Emanc.

R. GORDON. Attended very well, and voted always on the popular side. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.

Devizes. J. PEARCE. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. Grant to D. of Clarence; never f. rep. of taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab.; voted ag. the Qu.

T. G. ESTCOURT. Do., do.; except that he voted ag. rep. of Malt tax.

Downton. Hon. B. BOUVERIE, Sir T. PECHELL. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of the Malt tax; never f. any rep. of taxes or retrenchment. Sir T. Pechell voted f. Grant to D. of Clarence.

Heytesbury. E. H. A'COURT, H. HANDLEY. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the rep. of the Malt tax; never f. rep. of taxes, or f. red. of Estab.

Hindon. Hon. F. CALTHORPE. Voted f. Lord A. Hamilton's motion on Barons of Exch.; f. red.; f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu.

J. PLUMER. Voted ag. rep. of Malt tax; f. Cath. Emanc.; did not vote f. the Qu.; never f. rep. of taxes or red.

Ludgershall. S. **GRAHAM.** *Unless it be a mistake for the late member for St. Ives,* this young gentleman seems at all events to have got out of leading strings. He voted f. the Qu.; f. red. and rep. of taxes; f. Select Committee on conduct of Sheriff of Chester; f. Cath. Emanc. We believe it really is Sir James's son, his only son, who thus dares to disbelieve in the virtues of ministers.

Lord **BRECKNOCK.** Voted always f. ministers. His name does not appear on the Cath. Emanc. division.[1]

Marlmesbury. C. **FORBES.** Voted f. rep. of Malt tax; f. red.; ag. the Qu.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence.

W. **LEAKE.** Voted f. the Qu. We cannot trace his attendance on any other questions to which we refer.

Marlborough. Lord **BRUDENELL.** Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; never f. rep. of taxes or red.

Hon. J. **WODEHOUSE.** Voted f. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; never f. rep. of any taxes, or f. red.

Sarum, New. Lord **FOLKESTONE.** Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc., we believe, though his name is not on division; f. red. and rep. of taxes; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence.

W.W. **WYNDHAM.** Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; never f. red. or rep. of taxes; f. Mr. Hume's motion on Civil List Revenues.

Sarum, Old. J. **ALEXANDER.** Voted f. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; f. Cath. Emanc. Never f. any rep. of taxes, or f. red.

J.D. **ALEXANDER.** Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the rep. of Malt tax; never f. any rep. of taxes, or f. red.

Westbury. P. J. **MILES.** Voted ag. the Qu. We cannot trace his attendance on any other questions to which we refer.

Sir M. M. **LOPEZ.** Does not seem to have attended since his release.

Wilton. J. H. **PENRUDDOCK.** Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of Malt tax; never f. any retrenchments.

R. **SHELDON.** Does not appear to have attended on any question to which we refer, at least " nulla vestigia."

Wootton Basset. G. **PHILLIPS.** Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu.; f. red.

H. **TWISS.** Voted ag. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. Grant to D. of Clarence. Never f. any red.

WORCESTERSHIRE.

County. Hon. H. B. **LYGON.** Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. the rep. of the Malt tax; did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab. His name is not on the division on Cath. Emanc.

---

[1] We hope he has given Lord Stowell many a good dinner in return for his Lordship's exertions in the spring of 1820.

Sir T. E. WINNINGTON. Voted f. the Qu.; his name is not on division on Cath. Emanc.; Sir T. E. W. voted f. red., and otherwise well, when he attended, which was not often enough.

Bewdley. W. A. ROBERTS. There is a W. A. Robarts, who voted f. rep. of Malt tax. Is that W. A. Roberts of Bewdley? We suspect it is merely an error of the press for A. W. Robarts. We do not find the name of Roberts on any division to which we refer. Are we to congratulate the Hon. Gentleman on the philosophic doubts which he entertains of the usefulness of the House of Commons?

Droitwich. Lord SEFTON. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; one of Mr. Hume's phalanx; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence. A very valuable representative.

J. FOLEY. Since dead.

Evesham. Sir C. COCKERELL. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; f. Grant to D. of Clarence; and ag. the Qu.; he did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or f. red. of Est. or Estab.

J. E. R. BOUGHTON. Voted f. the Qu.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence; f. rep. of Malt tax; f. Mr. Brougham's motion on Droits of Admiralty; f. red.

Leominster. Lord HOTHAM. Voted ag. rep. of Malt tax; f. rep. of Husbandry Horse tax; f. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu.; once f. red.

Sir W. C. FAIRLIE. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of the Malt tax; never f. red.

Worcester. Col. DAVIES. A most conscientious exemplary member; voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu. It would be superfluous to say more. Worcester may be proud of such a representative.

Lord DEERHURST. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu.; it would be equally superfluous to say more of his parliamentary proceedings; they may be safely guessed to differ very materially from those of his colleague.

YORKSHIRE.

County. S. WORTLEY. Voted ag. rep. of Malt tax; ag. the Qu. Never voted in favor of any red. of Est. or Estab., or f. rep. of any taxes but the Wool tax; in favor of Cath. Emanc.[1] When we find Mr. S. W. voting for the rep. of the Wool tax, we know very well, without waiting for proofs, that he will nevertheless vote for the same amount on the Estimates; that he will support the same extravagant Establishments of ministers as before. He is ready at a secret meeting, at Ld. Liverpool's, or his more intimate friend Ld. Londonderry's, to pledge himself, and all whom he can influence, to assist in the imposition of any new burdens: he is ready, nay, desirous, for it is one of his delights, no less than of his friend Mr. Bankes, to come forward in the House after this private rehearsal, and pour forth his patriotic soul in deliberate disavowals of any tie but that of principle. If he, and that amiable "Brick and Plaster Economist," Mr. Bankes, and Sir T. Acland, had voted an address to the King praying the restoration of her Majesty's name to the Liturgy, instead of supporting the unfeeling, unmanly, proposition of the member for Bramber, there is little doubt but that the country would have been spared the exhibition of such an outrage on all justice as the late Queen's trial.[1] What but party spirit of the most reckless, disgusting sort, could have prevented them?

---

[1] Voted in 1819, for the three millions of new taxes; against enquiry into the State of the Nation; for grant of 10,000l. a year to the Duke of York.

Lord MILTON. The character and conduct of his Lordship is as much opposed to that of his colleague as possible; Lord Milton voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence; f. red. and f. rep. of Malt tax.

Aldborough. H. FYNES. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; never voted f. rep. of taxes, or red. of any Est. or Estab.

G. C. ANTROBUS.[2] Voted ag. the Qu.; never f. rep. of taxes, or reduction of Est. or Estab.

Beverley. J. WHARTON. Voted f. Select Committee on conduct of Sheriff of Chester; f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of taxes, and red. of Est. and Estab., ag. Grant to D. of Clarence.

G. L. FOX. Voted f. Select Committee on conduct of Sheriff of Dublin; f. rep. of Malt tax; f. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; did not vote f. red. of Est. or Estab.

Boroughbridge. G. MUNDAY. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or f. red. of Est. or Estab.

H. DAWKINS. *In Office.* Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.

Heydon. R. FARRAND. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu.; f. rep. of taxes, and red. of Est. or Estab.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence.

J. BAILLIE. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu. Voted f. two motions of Mr. Hume's; voted f. rep. of Malt tax; voted f. Grant to the D. of Clarence.

---

[1] In which the evidence of foreigners, who felt no responsibility, (the only safeguard of innocence, the only guarantee of truth) who ran no risk of punishment—for to whom were they amenable—who were actually dependent on perjury for their compensation and pay, was admitted and greedily credited.

[2] Mr. Antrobus's name does not appear on the division on Cath. Emanc. Bill.

Kingston-upon-Hull. J. **Mitchell.** Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc. Never voted f. red. of Est. or Estab., or rep. of taxes. We suspect that Mr. M. is a sort of Galleo—"who cares for none of these things;" and therefore seldom attends. Perhaps he thinks Hull to be sufficiently honored by his condescending to represent it.

D. **Sykes.** Voted f. the Qu.; f. red.; and attends regularly. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence.

Knaresborough. Rt. Hon. G. **Tierney.** Voted f. Cath. Emanc. It is unnecessary to say more of this gentleman's parliamentary conduct;—but we subjoin the following speech which he delivered in a debate on the Queen's Annuity Bill, Feb. 12, 1821: "He was unwilling to produce at that moment any grave discussion, but he trusted his silence would not subsequently be thrown in his teeth, or that he should be considered by that silence, pledged to any admission either that the grant was too large or too small." "Ex uno disce omnes."—He was unwilling not only "at that moment," but ever after to deliver any opinion on the grant. Why? we ask.

Sir J. **Mackintosh.** The most powerful speaker in the House. It is unnecessary to repeat his votes. We recommend to general attention his speech on the Alien Bill, June 1, 1820.—That the proudest distinction of England, viz. that of its being a land of refuge, should be sacrificed to the odious principle of a holy alliance, is one of the most decided and most appalling proofs of our degeneracy from the noble spirited hospitality of our ancestors. What has become of that constitutional jealousy of police restraints which used to distinguish us from every other country? What has become of that religious veneration of national prejudices, that wholesome antipathy to politics of foreign growth, that used to constitute the glory, because they were the elements of the pre-eminence of Great Britain?

Malton. Lord **Duncannon**, J. C. **Ramsden.** Voted f. the Qu. Always supported Mr. Hume. Lord D.'s name is not on Cath. Emanc. division; but we believe he voted f. Mr. Plunkett's motion, as did Mr. Ramsden.

Northallerton. H. **Pierse.** Voted f. Mr. Hume's motion on Collection of Revenue; ag. Barrack Agreement Bill; f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc. Did not vote f. red. or rep. of taxes.

Hon. W. S. **Lascelles.** Voted ag. the Qu. We cannot trace his attendance any further.

Pontefract. Lord **Pollington.** Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. the rep. of Malt tax. His name is not on the Cath. Emanc. division. Never voted f. rep. of taxes or f. red.

T. **Holdsworth.** Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of the Malt tax; f. Cath. Emanc. Never f. rep. of taxes or f. red.

Richmond. T. **Dundas**, S. M. **Barrett.** Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of taxes and f. red. T. Dundas voted ag. Grant to D. of Clarence. Mr. Barrett was one of Mr. Hume's phalanx.

Rippon. Rt. Hon. F. **Robinson.** *In Office.* Voted f. Cath. Emanc.

G. **Gipps.** Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; f. red.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence. His name is not on Cath. Emanc. division.

Scarborough. Rt. Hon. M. **Sutton.** Speaker; has not voted except ag. Cath. Emanc., we believe.

Hon. E. **Phipps.** *In Office.* Voted f. Cath. Emanc.

Thirsk. R. **Frankland.** Voted f. the Qu.; once f. red.; f. Cath. Emanc. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes. Yet voted otherwise well.

R. G. **Russell.** Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. Barrack Agreement Bill; f. rep. of Malt tax; once f. Red. of Army.

York. M. **Wyvill**, R. **Chaloner.** Voted f. the Qu. Both, we believe, f. Cath. Emanc.; the latter's name however does not appear. F. red., and rep. of Malt tax. Mr. Chaloner voted ag. Grant to D. of Clarence. We do not find Mr. Wyvill's name on the division.

Wales.

Anglesea. Earl of **Uxbridge.** A pretty sort of a senatorial gentleman this. Whenever, however, (suffice it to say of such a representative) he was present on a division, he voted in favor of ministers.

Beaumaris. T. F. **Lewis.** Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab.

Breconshire. T. **Wood.** Voted ag. the Qu.; f. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Never voted f. any rep. of taxes or red.

Brecon. G. G. **Morgan.** Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath.

Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Never voted f. any rep. of taxes or red. Did not vote ag. the Grant to D. of Clarence.

Cardiganshire. W. E. POWELL. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu. Never voted f. rep. of taxes or red.

Cardigan. P. PRYSE. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. Mr. Hume's motion on Collection of Revenue; ag. the Malt Duty Bill, (February 14th, 1821); f. red.; f. rep. of Malt tax.

Carmarthenshire. Hon. G. RICE. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. Grant to D. of Clarence; f. Select Committee on conduct of Sheriff of Chester. Never voted f. rep. of taxes. Voted ag. rep. of Malt tax; f. Mr. Hume's motion f. submitting Ordnance Est. in detail; f. red.

Carmarthen. J. JONES. Did not vote on any question to which we refer; if he attended at all.

Caernarvonshire. Sir R. WILLIAMS. Voted f. Mr. Creevey's motion, April 30th, 1821. We cannot trace his attendance on any other question to which we refer.

Caernarvon. Hon. Sir C. PAGET. *In Office.* His name is not on Cath. Emanc. division.

Denbighshire. Sir W. W. WYNNE. Did not vote f. the Qu. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of Malt tax; f. Lord A. Hamilton's motion on Barons of Exch. in Scot. Did not vote ag. Grant to D. of Clarence. Did not vote f. red. of Est. or Estab.

Denbigh. J. W. GRIFFITH. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of taxes, and red. of Est. and Estab.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence; f. Select Committees on conduct of Sheriffs of Chester and Dublin; constantly supported Mr. Hume.

Flintshire. Sir T. MOSTYN. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or red. of Est. or Estab.

Flint. Sir E. P. LLOYD. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu.; f. rep. of Malt tax. Voted once f. red. of Army; f. Mr. Hume's motion on Civil List.

Neither of these members attended of tenenough; when present they voted well.

Glamorganshire. Sir C. COLE. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. Select Committee on conduct of Sheriff of Dublin. Never voted f. rep. of taxes or red.

Cardiff. W. LEWIS. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. the rep. of Malt tax. Never voted f. rep. of taxes or red. The county of Glamorganshire, or the electors of Cardiff, might as well return two Sinecure holders, as their present members.

Merionethshire. Sir R. VAUGHAN. Voted ag. the Qu. We cannot trace his attendance any further.

County Monmouth. Sir C. MORGAN. Voted ag. the Qu.;

ag. Cath. Emanc. Never voted f. rep. of taxes or red. Did not vote ag. Grant to D. of Clarence.

Lord G. C. SOMERSET. *In Office.* Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.

Monmouth Town. Marq. of WORCESTER. Voted always with ministers; ag. Cath. Emanc.

Montgomeryshire. C. W. WYNN. Voted ag. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. Grant to D. of Clarence. Never voted f. any rep. of taxes or red.[1] F. Mr. Hume's motion on Collection of Revenue.

Montgomery. H. CLIVE. *In Office.* Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.

Haverfordwest. W. H. SCOURFIELD. Voted f. rep. of Malt tax; ag. the Qu.; his name is not on Cath. Emanc. division. Did not vote f. any retrenchment or expenditure.

Pembrokeshire. Sir J. OWEN. Voted ag. the Qu. Votes always f. ministers when present. His name is not on Cath. Emanc. division.

Pembroke. J. H. ALLEN. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of taxes and red.

Radnorshire. W. WILKINS. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu.; f. rep. of Malt tax; and except that he did not vote f. Mr. Hume's motion, he voted well.

Radnor. R. Price. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; and once f. small red. of the Army Est., but we do not find his name on any other division to which we refer.

Scotland.

Aberdeenshire. Hon. W. GORDON. Voted f. Grant to the D. of Clarence; f. rep. of Malt tax, on the first division, and ag. the rep. on the second division; voted ag. the Qu.; never f. any red. His name is not on Cath. Emanc. division.

Ayrshire. Lt. Gen. MONTGOMERY. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc. Never f. rep. of any taxes or f. red.

Ayr, Irvine, &c. T. KENNEDY. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of Malt tax, and f. red.

---

[1] It is worthy of remark, though not matter of astonishment, that this gentleman voted in 1812 *for* Mr. Brougham's motion on Droits of Admiralty, and in the year 1820 *against* it. In 1819, *against* the 10,000l. a year to Duke of York; in 1821 *for* the arrears to Duke of Clarence. If the comparison were to be carried further it would only exhibit a multiplication of inconsistencies, which are now very easily accounted for. He is appointed president of the Board of Control.

Argyleshire. Lord J. D. E. CAMPBELL. Does not seem to have attended at all during either of the sessions, at least "nulla vestigia."

Banffshire. Lord FIFE. Voted f. Grant to D. of Clarence; f. rep. of Malt tax. Never f. red. His name is not on the divisions on Cath. Emanc., or the Qu.'s case.

Berwickshire. Sir J. MARJORIBANKS. Voted f. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. the Qu. In the printed list of majority and minority on Marq. of Tavistock's motion on the Qu.'s case, it is hardly doubtful that Sir J. Marjoribanks and S. Majoribanks, have been made to change places. Did not vote f. any rep. of taxes, or f. red.

Caithnesshire. Lord J. STUART. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of Malt tax; f. red.

Cromartyshire. Hon. G. P. CAMPBELL. Has he attended at all, during either of the sessions? "Nulla vestigia."

ROYAL BURGHS.

Aberdeen, Montrose, Brechin, &c. District. J. HUME. Of this exemplary representative's votes it is unnecessary to say more than that he supported Catholic Emancipation. He has done more for the country in one session than the Whig party since the French revolution. Mr. Creevey has ably persevered in a similar course, and it would be invidious and unjust to say more in praise of one than the other. This only must be borne in mind, that the labor undergone by Mr. H., in examining all the Estimate details of an administration dependent on deceit and public apathy for its existence, is a merit which he can appropriate exclusively to himself. On looking back to the last Parliamentary campaign, we find that there were only fifteen or seventeen members who regularly supported Mr. H.;—why were not the rest of the 175 members of the opposition party in their places to assist him? what are we to think of the characters of men, who, on their own showing, could attend night and night, when the subject to be debated merely involved the dismissal of ministers, and their own admission to power, but who absented themselves whenever questions on which the relief and real welfare of the country depended, was to be considered? What are we to think, but that the calculations of party had superseded the ardor of patriotism.

We understand that Mr. H. intends to devote his attention chiefly in the ensuing session, to the expenditure of the colonies. We take the liberty of requesting him not to forget the importance of calling for a revision of the Civil List. He did not let the Grant pass without exerting himself to procure a diminution in its amount; and very properly remarked, " Much as he admired the system of this country, he thought there was nothing that could not be bought too dear, and he believed the civil government of this country was too dear. If ministers meant any thing by economy, they ought to begin with the first great establishment of the country. The Civil List had increased from year to year, and the average of 1816 was greater than that of the preceding years; that was the greatest period of expenditure, and the reduction in the expenditure, together with the return to cash payments, had since increased the value of money, some said 35 per cent., and he believed at least 25 per cent. To propose, therefore, to give 850,000*l.* as in 1816, was equivalent to proposing 1,000,000*l.* sterling now. To begin with the first establishment in the country was, therefore, the duty of ministers. Although they were above the example of any neighbouring country, yet they would do well to consider, that in a neighbouring country ministers had proposed such a reduction as ministers in this country ought to adopt. If ministers did not act so, they would in fact add 250,000*l.* to the establishment of 1816. The committees of 1804, 1812, and 1816, had ascribed the increase of expense in his Majesty's household to the rise of prices of all kinds. A reduction of prices would be the necessary consequence of a return to cash payments, and therefore the establishment of the Civil List ought to be accordingly reduced. He, for one, considered the present mode of proceeding wrong in principle; it was not doing justice to the House or to the country. So far, therefore, from keeping their pledge to that House and to the country, ministers had violated it to both. All he could do was to protest against such a proceeding. He approved highly of what the hon. member for Winchelsea had said the first night on the subject of the hereditary revenues; for no money ought to be given to the crown but what was under the control of that house. Inquiry had formerly been resisted upon this subject; and it was always said to them, 'Wait till a change takes place, and then you may enter freely into the inquiry.' This had been the bargain made with the house; but, now that the change had taken place, no inquiry was allowed.

" In 1815-16, when an inquiry into the Civil List was called for, it was shut out, and they were then told, that a time would occur when it would be proper to investigate the hereditary revenues, and those branches over which the House had no control. The House had, therefore, a right to take into consideration the state of the king's separate hereditary revenues; the revenue, for instance, derived from Scotland, which produced 80,000*l.* or 90,000*l.*; the droits of the Admiralty; the sums received from the 4½ per cent. duties; and the monies collected in Gibraltar. Consistently with the speech from the throne, the estimates laid before the House should be of the most economical description; but he would contend, that the estimates now submitted to their consideration were of the most extravagant kind." Mr. Tierney too, made the following very pertinent observations on the same occasion. "He knew nothing from authority, but it was a common proverb, that what every body said must be true to a certain extent; and would any man deny, that his late Majesty died worth a great deal of property? This property must have been saved out of the Civil List; and was the country to be saddled with a heavy Civil List, in order to enable the King to make savings? True it was, that his late Majesty had a large family to provide for, but no such motive existed in the present case. At this moment every farthing saved to the nation was of importance; and what pretence was there for granting one single sixpence beyond what was necessary? When we are talking of economy and retrenchment, I cannot come down here to take away the salaries of some petty clerks, or to reduce the pensions of a few poor half-pay officers, and shut my eyes to this proceeding, by which such enormous sums are to be voted to his Majesty without inquiry." And Lord J. Russell exposed the extravagance of the proposed allowance by the following striking objection. "It should be recollected, that when the last arrangement was made there were two establishments. There were, it might be said, two kings and two queens to be provided for; and was it not a little too much to say, (if any regard to economy was kept in view,) that the same sums should now be demanded as when these several establishments were to be supported?"

The whole expenses of Great Britain and Ireland, civil and military, in 1792, were something less than seven millions. The charge for our present establishments is twenty-two millions. It is mockery and insult to say that such expenditure is necessary. *The public will surely be astonished to learn, that the army alone costs now what the whole expenses of the country amounted to in* 1792.[1]

"The people of America, setting aside the interest of their national debt, (we are indebted for the statement to that able and public spirited paper, the Scotsman,) pay about 4*s.* a head for the support of a government, which secures property, dispenses justice equally, guards the national honor and rights, maintains liberty of person, speech, and writing, in a degree never equalled, and (what is of no small moment,) is always in harmony with the opinions and feelings of the people. The people of this country pay about 22*s.* a head for the mere expense of their government, exclusive of a sum two or three times as great for public debt and poor's rates. Supposing the Americans, by way of amending their government, to adopt our scale of expenditure, and pay 22*s.* instead of 4*s.* a head, what improvements would they introduce as a compensation for the 4-5ths of additional outlay. Their present system seems to want nothing that is essential to good government, unless it be sinecures, rotten boroughs, a pensioned aristocracy, restrictions on the press and public meetings, alien bills, and functionaries, who hold the sentiments of the people in utter contempt and derision. The Americans, we may be assured, will adhere to their simple and frugal system. We do not contend for reducing all our establishments to the scale of the United States. Ours is a monarchy and an old country. But every one can see at a glance that nothing can justify an expenditure in Great Britain *eleven times* as great as in the United States. We cannot shut our eyes against this obvious truth, that the utmost evil a rigid economy could inflict upon us, would be to bring us into the condition of the United States; an alternative, we venture to affirm, which would not much alarm the tax payers, however dreadful it may sound to the tax receivers."

---

[1] The sum of 6,643,968*l.* was voted for Army Estimates last session.

We caution the public against being influenced by the taunts thrown on Mr. Hume by the ministerial scribes. Let it be borne in mind that the government accounts are purposely made up in the most perplexed form possible, and that every difficulty that could be thrown in the way of his enquiries, has been, and will continue to be, opposed. Hitherto he has been, fortunately, very correct in his statements, and we are astonished that he has been able to be so. But when details are refused, and he is left to make his calculations, without the assistance of those documents which government officers keep back for the purposes of unfair refutation, it is to be expected that such witty gentlemen as Messrs. Palmerston, Ward, and Croker, will take advantage of their own wrong, and try to make Mr. Hume seem not trustworthy from having fallen into mistakes. But if he were to err on almost every occasion, it would not detract from his claims to public gratitude. It is his unparalleled assiduity, his close examination of the Estimates, his exposure of extravagance and jobs that entitle Mr. H. to the high character he has acquired.

Dumfries. W. R. K. DOUGLAS. Voted f. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. rep. of Malt tax; ag. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; never f. rep. of taxes, or f. red.

Dysart. Sir R. FERGUSON. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu.; one of Mr. Hume's phalanx; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence.

Elgin. A. FARQUHARSON. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; did not vote on the Qu.'s case; voted f. rep. of Malt tax, Husbandry Horse tax, and House and Window duties; 3 times f. red.

Fortrose, &c. G. CUMMING. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu.; never f. any rep. of taxes, or f. red.

Glasgow, &c. A. CAMPBELL. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc. We cannot trace his attendance any farther.

Jedburgh, Haddington, &c. Sir H. D. HAMILTON. Voted f. the Qu.; f. rep. of Malt tax; f. Cath. Emanc.; never f. any red.

Peebles. H. MONTEITH. Voted f. rep. of Malt tax on the first division, and ag. rep. on the second division; ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; never f. any red.

Perth. Hon. H. LINDSAY. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; never f. rep. of taxes, or f. red.

Stirling. R. DOWNIE. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu.; never f. any red., or f. rep. of taxes.

Tain. Sir H. INNES. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of the Malt tax; never f. any red., or rep. of taxes. His name is not on Cath. Emanc. division.

Dumbartonshire. J. BUCHANAN. Voted f. rep. of Malt tax on first division, and ag. rep. on second division; f. Grant to D. of Clarence; his name is not on Cath. Emanc. division; he does not seem to have voted on the Qu.'s case; never voted f. rep. of taxes, or f. red.

Dumfriesshire. Sir W. JOHNSTON HOPE. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; his name is not on Cath. Emanc. division; never f. rep. of taxes, or f. red.

Edinburghshire. Sir G. CLERK. *In Office.* Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.

Edinburgh. Rt. Hon. W. DUNDAS. *In Office.* His name is not on Cath. Emanc. division.

Elginshire. F. W. GRANT. Voted ag. the Qu.; f. rep. of Malt tax; f. Cath. Emanc.; never voted f. any red.

Fifeshire. J. WEMYSS. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of Malt tax; never f. any red.

Forfarshire. Hon. W. MAULE. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. Mr. Hume's motion on Collection of Revenue; does not seem to have voted on the Qu.'s case; never voted f. rep. of taxes, or f. red.

Haddingtonshire. Sir J. G. SUTTIE. Voted ag. rep. of Malt tax; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu.; never voted f. rep. of taxes, or red.

Invernesshire. Rt. Hon. C. GRANT. *In Office.* Voted f. Cath. Emanc.

Kinrosshire. R. BRUCE. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu.; f. rep. of Malt tax; never f. red.

Kincardineshire. Sir A. RAMSAY. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.;

f. Mr. Hume's motion on Collection of Revenues; f. rep. of Malt tax, Husbandry Horse tax, and House and Window duties. Does not seem to have voted on the Qu.'s case.

Kirkudbright. J. DUNLOP. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; f. Cath. Emanc.; never f. rep. of taxes, or f. red.

Lanarkshire. L. C. A. HAMILTON. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence; f. rep. of taxes, and f. red. Voted almost constantly f. Mr. Hume's motions.

Linlithgowshire. Sir A. HOPE. Voted ag. the Qu. We cannot trace his attendance any farther.

Orkney and Shetland. J. BALFOUR. Voted f. Qu.'s name to Liturgy; but ag. censure of ministers for their proceedings ag. Her Majesty. Does not seem to have attended to any other purpose, at least "nulla vestigia."

Peebleshire. Sir J. MONTGOMERY. Unless this gentleman can put in claim to any of the votes attributed to the member for Ayrshire, (and if he has any good taste he will rather rest contented with his own obscurity,) we have met with no proofs of his attendance during either of the sessions.

Perthshire. J. DRUMMOND. Voted ag. rep. of the Malt tax; we do not meet with his name on any other divisions to which we refer.

Pittenweem, Anstruther, &c. Rt. Hon. Sir W. RAE. *In Office.* Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.

Renfrewshire. J. MAXWELL, jun. Voted f. the Qu.; f. red.; f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence. Voted f. most of Mr. Hume's motions.

Rosshire. T. MACKENZIE. Voted f. rep. of Malt tax; ag. the Qu.; we do not find his name on Cath. Emanc. division; did not vote f. any red.

Roxburghshire. Sir A. DON. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. Grant to D. of Clarence. Never f. red. or rep. of taxes. His name does not appear on any of the divisions on the Qu.'s case.

Selkirkshire. W. E. LOCKHART. Voted ag. the Qu.; and unless (which we very much suspect) it be a mistake for the member for Oxford, once f. a red. on the Ordnance Est. Never f. rep. of taxes. His name is not on Cath. Emanc. division.

Stirlingshire. Sir H. DRUMMOND. Voted f. Grant to D. of Clarence. We cannot trace his attendance on any other questions to which we refer.

Sutherlandshire. G. M. GRANT. Voted f. the Qu.; f. rep. of taxes; f. Cath. Emanc. Never f. red.

Wigtonshire. J. H. BLAIR. Voted f. rep. of Malt tax; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. the Qu. Never f. red.

Wigton, Whitehorn, &c. Sir J. Osborn. *In Office.* His name is not on the Cath. Emanc. division.

Ireland.

Dublin, County. H. Hamilton. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. the rep. of Malt tax; f. Cath. Emanc.; never f. retrenchment or rep. of taxes.

R. W. Talbot. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. economy and red.

Dublin, University. Rt. Hon. W. C. Plunkett. Did nothing, as far as we can collect, except move the Emanc. Bill.

Dublin, City. Sir R. Shaw. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; f. Cath. Emanc.; did not vote f. any retrenchment or rep. of taxes.

T. Ellis. Do., do., except that he voted ag. Cath. Emanc.

Antrim. Hon. R. B. O'Neil. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu. Never f. rep. of taxes or retrenchment.

Member since dead.

Lisburne. H. B. Seymour. *In Office.* Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.

Armaghshire. Hon. H. Caulfield. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. retrenchment and rep. of taxes.

C. Brownlow. Voted f. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Never f. rep. of taxes, or retrenchments.

Armagh. W. Stuart. If he ever attended, "nulla vestigia."

Athlone. D. Kerr. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Never f. rep. of taxes or retrenchment. His name does not appear on the Cath. Emanc. division.

Belfast. Lord Belfast. Voted ag. rep. of Malt tax. We cannot trace his attendance any further.

Bandonbridge, Bandon. Lord Bernard. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Never f. rep. of taxes or retrenchments.

Carlow, County. H. Bruen. Voted ag. rep. of Malt tax. We cannot trace his attendance farther.

Sir U. Burgh. *In Office.* His name is not on Cath. Emanc. division.

Carlow, City. C. Harvey. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; f. Cath. Emanc. Never f. rep. of taxes or f. retrenchment.

Carrickfergus. Sir A. Chichester. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Never f. rep. of taxes, or f. retrenchments.

Cashel. E. J. Collett. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Never f. rep. of taxes, or f. retrenchment.

Cavanshire. N. Sneyd. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; ag. the Qu. Never f. rep. of taxes, or f. retrenchment.

Rt. Hon. J. M. Barry. His name does not appear on Cath. Emanc. division.

Clareshire. Sir E. O'Brien. If he ever attended "nulla vestigia."

Rt. Hon. V. Fitzgerald. Is, and has been, in Sweden as Envoy.

Clonmel. J. M. Dawson. Voted ag. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Never f. rep. of taxes, or f. retrenchment.

Ennis. R. Wellesley. If he ever attended "nulla vestigia."

Cork, County. Hon. R. Hare. Voted f. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. rep. of Malt tax. His name does not appear on Cath. Emanc. Never f. retrenchment or rep. of taxes.

Viscount Kingsborough. Voted ag. the Qu.; f. Grant to D. of Clarence. Never f. retrenchment or rep. of taxes.

Cork, City. H. Hutchinson. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc. One of Mr. Hume's most constant supporters. Voted f. Grant to D. of Clarence.

Sir N. Colthurst. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu. Never f. rep. of taxes, or f. retrenchment.

Mallow. W. Becher. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence; f. retrenchment and rep. of taxes.

Kinsale. Sir J. Rowley, Adm. If he ever attended "nulla vestigia."

Youghal. J. Hyde. Voted f. the Qu. We cannot trace his attendance on any other questions to which we refer.

Donegalshire.[1] G. V. Hart, Earl Mountcharles. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; ag. Cath. Emanc. Never f. red. or rep. of taxes.

Downshire. Lord A. Hill. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; a very valuable member. Always f. retrenchment and rep. of taxes.

M. Ford. We have not met with his name on any division.

Downpatrick. J. W. Maxwell. Voted ag. the Qu. We cannot trace his attendance farther. We suspect the "W. Maxwell" on three minorities f. red. to be a mistake f. the member f. Renfrewshire, but we may be wrong in our suspicion.

---

[1] G. V. Hart, Esq. voted for motion on Irish 10 per cent. duties.

Newry. Hon. T. J. NEEDHAM. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; never f. retrenchment, or rep. of taxes. We do not find his name on the Cath. Emanc. division.

Fermanaghshire. Hon. Sir G. L. COLE, M. ARCHDALE. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc. They neither of them *seem* to have attended to any other purpose though M. Archdale is in Office.

Enniskillen. R. MAGENNIS. Voted ag. rep. of Malt tax; ag. Cath. Emanc.; did not vote on the Qu.'s case, or f. rep. of taxes, or f. red.

Galwayshire. J. DALY. Voted f. rep. of Malt tax; ag. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; never f. red.

R. MARTIN. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. Grant to D. of Clarence; and always, on other questions, f. ministers.

This man plays the buffoon too much, but he has one good point —we respect him for his humanity.

Galway Town. M. G. PRENDERGAST. Voted ag. rep. of Malt tax; ag. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. Grant to D. of Clarence; never f. rep. of taxes, or f. red.

Kerryshire. Rt. Hon. M. FITZGERALD. Voted f. the Qu.; f. rep. of taxes, and f. red.; f. Cath. Emanc.

J. CROSBIE. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; f. Cath. Emanc.; did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or f. red.

Tralee. J. CUFFE. Voted ag. the Qu. His name is not on Cath. Emanc. division. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or f. red.

Kildareshire. Lord W. C. FITZGERALD. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of taxes and f. red.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence.

R. LATOUCHE. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of Husbandry Horse tax; f. Mr. Hume's motion on Collection of Revenue; did not vote on the Qu.'s case; voted f. red. twice.

Drogheda. H. METCALFE. Voted ag. rep. of Malt tax; f. Cath. Emanc.; did not vote on the Qu.'s case; never voted f. retrenchment, or rep. of taxes.

Dundalk. G. HARTOPP. Voted ag. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; never f. retrenchment, or rep. of taxes.

Louthshire. Rt. Hon. T. SKEFFINGTON, Hon. J. JOCELYN. Do not seem to have attended at all during either of the Sessions, at least, if they did, "nulla vestigia."

Dungannon. Hon. T. KNOX. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. motion on Irish 10 per cent. duties; never f. retrenchment or rep. of taxes.

A. W. CLIFFORD. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. retrenchment.

Kilkennyshire. Hon. C. H. CLARKE. Does not appear to have attended at all during either of the Sessions, at least, "nulla vestigia," if he did.

Hon. C. F. PONSONBY. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of Malt tax; f. Select Committee on conduct of Sheriff of Dublin. Did not vote f. red.

Kilkenny. Rt. Hon. D. BROWNE. Voted ag. rep. of Malt tax; f. Grant to D. of Clarence; f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu.

King's County. T. BERNARD, Lord ORMANTON. If they ever attended, "nulla vestigia."

Leitrimshire. L. WHITE. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu.; f. Select Committee on conduct of Sheriff of Dublin; did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or f. red.

Hon. J. W. CLEMENTS. Voted ag. rep. of Malt tax; f. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. Cath. Emanc.; does not seem to have voted on the Qu.'s case; did not vote f. red. or f. rep. of taxes.

Longfordshire. Sir G. FEATHERSTONE. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu. We cannot trace his attendance on any other questions to which we refer.

Lord FORBES. Voted ag. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. Select Committee on conduct of Sheriff of Dublin; did not vote f. rep. of taxes, or f. red.

Limerick, County. Hon. R. FITZGIBBON. Voted ag. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc. Never f. rep. of taxes, or red. of Estab.

S. O'GRADY. Voted f. Mr. Hume's motion on Collection of Revenue. F. Mr. Hume's motion on Civil List; f. rep. of Husbandry Horse tax, and Malt tax; f. Cath. Emanc.; frequently f. retrenchments. Did not vote on Qu.'s case.

Limerick, City. T. S. RICE. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu.; ag. Grant to D. of Clarence. One of Mr. Hume's phalanx.

Londonderryshire. G. R. DAWSON.[1] Voted f. Grant to D. of Clarence; f. small red. of the Army. Did not vote on the case of the Qu., or on the Cath. question, or f. rep. of taxes.

---

[1] Mr. Dawson spoke to the following effect, on the Army Estimates, March 12th, 1820. "Of all the items of public Expenditure, that for the support of the Army in its present extent, could be best dispensed with. It appeared to him impossible, that the Country could go on under such an enormous expenditure: Economy must begin some where, and in no quarter could it be better practised than in the Military Department.—If the spirit of disturbance were to manifest itself, the Government possessed the power of checking it by a much more constitutional force, the Police; in addition to the Police, the Yeomanry might be called upon. What then was the reason why such a force was kept up? Did they dread going to war?—No. But if they did, he trusted that we should rely upon our Naval power, and

A. R. STEWART. Voted f. Grant to D. of Clarence; f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu. Did not vote f. rep. of taxes or retrenchment.

Londonderry. Rt. Hon. **G. F. HILL.** *In Office.* Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.

Coleraine. Sir **J. P. BERESFORD.** Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Never f. any rep. of taxes, or f. retrenchment.

Mayoshire. **D. BROWNE.** Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. the Qu. Did not vote f. any red. or rep. of taxes.

J. BROWN. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Never f. any red. or rep. of taxes. The following is an extract from a speech delivered by him on the 23d January, 1821:—"As to ministers, he, for one, must approve of their conduct on *trying* emergencies. He saw in them no deficiency

not indulge in those Continental struggles which had already cost the Nation so much. The House had heard much of the distresses of the Country. Nothing he conceived but the most rigid Economy could remove the pressure under which it suffered: a large Military force he considered an useless burthen—and (mark what follows) *though he was not prepared to accede to the motion of the Honorable Officer*, (Col. Davies) still he was ready to record his opinion, that on the whole, the Estimates ought to be some millions less than they were."

He had in an earlier part of his speech said, "At a period when distress stared ministers in the face, it would be something worse than a delusion to deny that Economy in the strictest sense of the word, was not imperatively necessary.—*Not only did he conceive Economy necessary, but he would say that the most rigid parsimony alone could save the Country.*" Colonel Davies' motion was, that the chairman, &c. &c. "in order that time might be given for the appointment of a Committee up-stairs, to consider the propriety of generally reducing our Military Establishments." Mr. Dawson did not suggest the preferableness of any other course, but simply contented himself with stating that he was not prepared to accede to the motion. The public are not ignorant why he was not prepared, and are full as much shocked at the effrontery of such calculations, as he would be, were he not eventually to be appointed to a Secretaryship under his brother-in-law. We cannot omit to relate the sequel. We must suppose a friend to have hinted to him the necessity of his following up such strong language by a motion for Economy in some shape or other; we must also suppose Mr. Peel to have admonished him of the too great lengths to which his speech had committed him. We now see him without any alternative but a compromise, to save himself with his political patron on the one hand, and the public on the other. Le voila donc. On the 14th February Mr. M'Donald, in the Committee on the Army Estimates, moves for a reduction of 10,000 men. To meet Mr. Peel's views of keeping well with the ministers, though such a reduction, if carried into effect, would only save 390,000 odd pounds, and on the 12th, only two days before, Mr. D. had urged the retrenchment of "*some millions*," (the Estimates were for nearly seven millions,) HE OPPOSES Mr. M'Donald's motion; and then, to preserve, if possible, with the public, the appearance of adhesion to his previously published positions, he himself proposes a diminution of 5000 men. We believe we are correct in stating that Mr. Peel did not even divide in favor of the five thousand!!!

of virtue or wisdom." The last *trying* emergency over which ministers had presided, was the *trial* of the Queen. We are not surprised that a gentleman who admired their conduct on that occasion, should see in them no deficiency of virtue or wisdom for other emergencies.

Meathshire. Lord BECTIVE, Sir M. SOMERVILLE. Voted ag. rep. of the Malt tax; f. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu. Never f. red. or rep. of taxes.

Monaghanshire. C. P. LESLIE, Hon. H. R. WESTENRA. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. rep. of the Malt tax; ag. Cath. Emanc. Never f. rep. of taxes or f. red. Hon. H. R. Westenra voted f. Select Committee on conduct of Sheriff of Dublin.

Portarlington. D. RICARDO. Voted f. the Qu.; one of the patriotic phalanx that supported Mr. Hume. We do not find his name on the Cath. Emanc. division.

Queen's County. Sir H. PARNELL. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; he does not seem to have voted f. Qu.'s name to the Liturgy; one of Mr. Hume's phalanx.

Sir C. COOTE. Does not appear to have attended at all during either of the sessions; if he ever attended, "nulla vestigia."

Ross. F. LEIGH. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc. We cannot trace his attendance on any other question to which we refer.

Roscommonshire. A. FRENCH. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; f. Select Committee on conduct of Sheriff of Dublin; does not seem to have voted on the Qu.'s case; never voted f. red. or f. rep. of taxes.

Hon. S. MAHON. Voted f. the Qu.; f. rep. of Malt tax; f. Cath. Emanc.; did not vote f. any red.

Sligo, County. C. O'HARA. If he ever attended, nulla vestigia.

E. S. COOPER. Voted ag. rep. of Malt tax; we cannot trace his attendance on any other question to which we refer.

Sligo, Borough. O. Wynne. Voted ag. Cath. Emanc.; we cannot trace his attendance on any other questions to which we refer.

Tipperaryshire. Hon. F. A. PRITTIE. Voted f. the Qu.; ag. Barrack Agreement bill; we cannot trace his attendance on any other questions to which we refer.

Rt. Hon. W. BAGWELL. *In Office.* Voted f. Cath. Emanc.

Tyroneshire. Sir J. STEWART. Voted ag. rep. of Malt tax; f. Select Committee on Irish 10 per cent. duties; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. the Qu.; never f. red., or f. rep. of taxes.

W. STEWART. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of Malt tax; f. Mr. Hume's motion on Collection of Revenue; f.

Lord A. Hamilton's motion on Barons of Exch. in Scot.; never f. red.

Waterford, County. R. Power. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of taxes and retrenchment.

Lord G. Beresford. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; ag. rep. of Malt tax; never f. retrenchment or rep. of taxes.

Waterford, City. Rt. Hon. Sir J. Newport. Voted f. the Qu.; f. Cath. Emanc.; one of Mr. Hume's phalanx.[1]

Westmeathshire. Hon. H. Pakenham. Voted ag. the Qu.; f. Grant to D. of Clarence; never f. red. or rep. of taxes; ag. Cath. Emanc.

Hon. G. Rochford. Voted ag. rep. of Malt tax. We cannot trace his attendance on any other questions to which we refer.

Wexford, County. Viscount Stopford. Voted ag. the Qu.; f. rep. of Malt tax on the first division; ag. rep. of Malt tax on second division; ag. Cath. Emanc.; never f. any red.

R. S. Carew. Voted f. the Q.; f. Cath. Emanc.; f. rep. of taxes and red.

Wexford, City. W. Wigram. Voted ag. the Qu.; ag. Cath. Emanc.; f. Grant to D. of Clarence; ag. rep. of Malt tax. Never f. rep. of taxes, or f. red.

Wicklowshire. Hon. G. L. Proby. If he ever attended, nulla vestigia.

J. Grattan. Voted f. Cath. Emanc.; did not vote on the Qu.'s case; frequently voted f. Mr. Hume and Mr. Creevey's motions; voted ag. Grant to D. of Clarence; f. rep. of Malt tax.

The following questions naturally occur to our minds in considering the state of the Sister-Country.—

Why is a Protestant establishment imposed on a Catholic population? Why are a distressed people compelled to pay a clergyman who has no duties to perform, as well as a priest of their own religious persuasion? What, we ask, would have been the state of Scotland if we had forced upon that country our church establishments?—and why is a different system from that framed for Scotland followed towards unhappy Ireland? If, however, it be resolved, that the Protestant ministers having been once introduced, the proposition of withdrawing them will never be admitted, can there be any objection, any doubt of the duty that devolves on the maintainers of Uniformity, to pay for the support of their own theory, and not sacrifice the substantial good of the nation for the sake of form? It will not be contended, we presume, that the system should be continued with the view of destroying Catholicism: the folly, no less than the wickedness of such a scheme, has been too long apparent. Let then the Protestant clergy of Ireland be paid by the government, and the irritation which demoralises, while it alienates from us the Catholic population of Ireland, will be removed. By respecting their feelings, not by outraging them; by suiting our legislation to their circumstances, not by striving to coerce their conformity to our legislation, may we alone hope to reform their habits, and secure their submission. The country must be relieved from wretchedness, before it can be advanced in civilisation.

---

[1] Extract from speech of Sir J. Newport, June 14, 1821. "If the agriculturists understood their true interests, they would support all propositions for the reduction of the public expenditure."

Our readers are acquainted with the scheme of the cabinet for curing the landed interest of its complaints. The sanguine must have been wofully disappointed. For our parts, we confess it to be as good as we could expect. From what passed in the House of Commons after the development of this notable scheme, we are led to fear that Mr. Wodehouse,[1] (of whom we had hoped better things,) and Mr. H. Sumner, are incurables. Perhaps Sir E. Knatchbull, being receiver for the county, finds it well worth his while to be indifferent to county clamor. Some one very like him was overheard, last week, spouting to himself, as he passed across New Palace-yard,

> ———— populus me sibilat, at mihi plaudo
> Ipse domi simulac nummos contemplor in Arcâ.

It is reported,[2] that he has got leave from Lord Londonderry to speak up for retrenchment as often and as loudly as he chooses, provided he does not vote for it, except on a small scale, and when there is no risk of success incurred. Sir T. Acland is like an overgrown school-boy who knows he is in the wrong, but for the sake of appearances won't knock under. Mr. Gooch is just what he was last session;—Mr. S. Wortley was as fulsome in complimenting Lord Londonderry as ever, and intends to oppose "any further repeal of taxes" than that of the additional Malt Duty. He also enlivened the House by denominating the late war one which "*protected the liberties of the people.*" If there is any one thing more disgusting than another, it is to hear such a man as Mr. S. Wortley talk of the liberties of the people. We shall expect next to hear Sir W. Curtis talk sentiment. It is only in the House of Commons that he would dare to insult the country with such mockery. But, alas, John Bull is so easily cheated, that we ought not to be surprised at any language addressed to him. He was made to believe, by the corrupt tools of a bigotted king, and the interested associations of the commercial branches, that to thwart the French in their struggle for freedom, was to save himself from slavery, that to let the French become relieved from tyranny, was to rivet his own chains. National jealousy was called in aid—nay, every bad passion was appealed to, and at last aroused to support Mr. Wilberforce's friend's religious war. Well, after our neighbours, in spite of our hostility, had triumphed over both foreign and domestic foes, they became again the instruments of a despot. Now, we were to fight them because Buonaparte was their autocrat; before, we had waged war on them because they would be their own governors. It mattered not—George III. hated liberty, and William Pitt loved his place; John Bull was credulous,—and the result has been the restoration of the Bourbons, the battle of Waterloo,[1] and additional taxation in time of peace.

---

[1] Mr. Wodehouse *opposed* Lord Althorp's motion which went to record that the House was not satisfied with the amount of retrenchment proposed by Ministers, though by way of throwing dust in the eyes of his constituents he had *said* on the 18th Feb. that 'Government had not gone sufficiently far' in their measures.

[2] We do not believe the report—but Sir E. K.'s conduct is rather difficult to construe, and we think it but fair to let him know what things are said of him.

Mr. S. Wortley said not one word on the "extravagance of ministers," which Mr. Benett of Wilts had accused him of supporting. He merely gave notice of his objection to the repeal of more taxes. What is the advantage of peace, we ask Mr. Wortley, unless it be distinguished by the lightness of the burthens imposed on the people? But we are wasting words to argue with a man whose only principle is to keep his own party safe in power and place.

Mr. Gooch concluded his speech by saying, that he should vote against any reduction of the army, and congratulating the House on "what had fallen from the noble Marquis." He then "hoped to God," and quoted two lines of a prayer.

Mr. W. Burrell and Mr. Curteis, in spite of their speeches, have voted with ministers against Lord Althorp's motion. Mr. Davenport seems disposed to do his duty. We subjoin Mr. Davenport's speech on Monday, February 18, together with Mr. Curwen's and Mr. Ricardo's speeches on the same day. The latter gentleman's opinions on taxation, it will appear, have been very grossly misrepresented.

---

[1] Why, we should like to ask, was our claim to be repaid the expense of maintaining the French prisoners given up? Why—except for the sake of paying the King of France a compliment at the expense of this country; to make his return to the nation that had abjured him originative at least of some advantage to his subjects? Had not the people of this country a prior right to be consulted, a people who had suffered from taxation in a degree never before experienced by any nation?—Why was 500,000*l*. paid for the provisioning of the Russian fleet in the Medway?—should we have paid for them had they remained in the Baltic?—and why should the mere change of station, stipulated for, as a manifestation of the Emperor's sincerity, have converted us into their paymasters and victuallers?

Mr. Davenport said, "that as many honorable members had delivered their opinions upon this important topic, he was anxious to state, that he felt considerable disappointment at the statement of the noble Marquis. When he heard of the florishing state of the finances, he was of opinion that more relief ought to have been granted by the reduction of taxation. He must also notice a mistake which the noble Marquis had fallen into in the course of that statement. He calculated that the farmer paid only five per cent. in taxes upon his out-goings, whereas in the county of Chester, which he (Mr. Davenport) had the honor to represent, in dairies it was as much as that upon one article alone, namely, salt. If there could be one tax more grievous and oppressive than another, it was that to which he had just alluded."

Mr. Curwen said, "that after what he had heard, he could not hope for much relief to the distress of the country from the labors of the present session. He was friendly to the appointment of the original Committee, but he had been exceedingly disappointed in its results. He believed that nothing more could be expected from its re-appointment. It was clear, that with a committee, the whole session would be passed without any definite measures being effected; and he would ask whether it ought to be left to chance for a bad harvest to throw open the ports, and cause the importation of as much foreign grain as was equal to eight months' consumption of the country? The noble Lord said, that the proportion of taxation to the produce of the land was five per cent.; and, therefore, he gave them the relief of one half per cent. by repealing the additional Malt tax. Now, so far wrong was the noble Marquis in his calculation, he was convinced a saving of 20 per cent. would accrue to the farmer by the repeal of the Malt taxes, and of the taxes upon Barley, Salt, Leather, Soap, and Candles. With regard to the noble Lord's plan, as it applied to the Sinking Fund, he, Mr. Curwen, was as anxious as any one for retaining a Sinking Fund to a certain extent, but let them give all the surplus income of the country till the present moment to the relief of agriculture, and let the Sinking Fund be increased by the million of savings in the next year, and in the years which were to follow. He did believe that the plan for taking off the surplus corn from the markets when the averages were below 55 shillings, would be productive of great benefits. The corn so bought would be warehoused, and ready to come out when the markets should get above 60 shillings, and thereby keep them at a steady price, which would prevent the importation of foreign grain, and put a check upon those injurious speculations which had been so largely carried on. The question of admitting foreign corn was a most important one, which affected the interests of all classes; and the noble Lord and his colleagues ought to be prepared to take it upon themselves without the support of a committee. He was astonished to hear the honorable member for Suffolk,[1] while he acknowledged that the distress of his constituents was increasing, express his satisfaction and thanks to the noble Lord for the statement which he had made. If that was the language to be used by county members, he did indeed despair. If they had acted firmly and properly, they would have forced ministers to make reductions. He was sure that relief afforded to the agricultural interest by the repeal of the taxes upon salt, leather, and soap, would cause a considerable increase in the revenue by the increased consumption which they would create. He was very glad to hear that the revenue was in so florishing a condition. He was utterly at a loss upon what principles to account for the increase; but he was told that it was so, and he was bound to believe it."

Mr. Ricardo "agreed in the satisfaction expressed by an honorable member, at the statement of the noble Marquis, as far as the improvement of the revenue went; but he did not agree with him that the amount of the repeal of taxes was such as ought to satisfy the country. The honorable member appeared to him to have made one great mistake in his calculations. He said that the Sinking Fund being increased would lower the rate of interest, and that landlords would consequently derive advantages which they could disseminate among their tenants, and thus afford general relief to the agricultural classes. He agreed that the landlord would derive these advantages, if the Sinking Fund would have the effect which the honorable member expected from it, but it would have no such effect. He thought the Sinking Fund the greatest support of public credit: and if he could have any security for its application to the object for which it was designed, it would have no greater friend than himself. But after the experience they had had of all Sinking Funds, of Sir Robert Walpole's Sinking Fund, of Mr. Pitt's Sinking Fund; after they had seen the latter made away with by the right honorable the Chancellor of the Exchequer,—he was convinced that a Sinking Fund could be nothing but a fatal delusion to the people. They were induced to pay to it in the hope of lessening their debt, when in point of fact, it invariably increased it; for when it had accumulated to a certain extent, the minister was sure to apply it to the payment of interests upon loans which went to make the debt greater. It was said by some, that a Sinking Fund was necessary to intimidate our enemies; but how was that possible, if it was applied to the liquidation of the debt? If the present Sinking Fund were allowed to go on, he was sure it would be applied at some future time to the same objects which had absorbed its predecessors, and there would be nothing of it left but a reduced surplus of two or three hundred thousand pounds. He was quite surprised to hear his right honorable friend opposite (Mr. Huskisson) support the principle of the noble Marquis of lending out money to parishes. It was so contrary to all reason, that he was sure it must be abandoned. He wished to say a few words more upon the subject of taxation. There were two descriptions of taxes; one of which fell upon the producer, and, if the producer came to that house to ask for relief, he would say that the house should shut its doors upon him. He would say to him, 'You have had the power in your own hands of avoiding the tax, and if you have not regulated the produce to the demand, you must bear the consequence.' But there was another description of taxation, which fell entirely upon the consumer; and if he came in distress, they ought to throw open their doors to relieve him. His complaints were of a very different nature, and deserved the utmost attention. Well, then, if they took off the Malt tax, he should say they took it off the consumer. If they took off the tax on soap, and it was asked whether they took it off the agricultural producer or the consumer, he should say the consumer. But this was an argument with him why taxation ought to be reduced. He saw taxation pressing in this manner upon the helpless consumer, not indeed with the reduction spoken of by his honorable and learned Friend, but it did press so as to destroy the comforts and the means of a large class of the people from whom it ought to be removed. *It had been said that he denied taxation to be an evil; on the contrary he held it to be a very great evil, and only differed with his friends as to the effect which it produced in certain cases.* Many gentlemen seemed to think that the paper system could not have been carried on without a depreciation of the currency; but this he considered a mistake. It might be a wholesome system notwithstanding the measures of restriction. It had been said that the agriculturists had received high rents during the war. So they had, but they had higher prices to pay for all articles not produced by themselves. The high rents were of no benefit to them, except by comparison with the state of the stockholder; and in that point of view, undoubtedly, the high rents were a benefit to the landholder; for the stockholder sustained a loss by the altered view of money, inasmuch as his dividend was not increased proportionably with the depreciation. On the whole, he was perfectly satisfied that, in a public point of view, the stockholder had been a loser rather than a gainer by the transaction."

---

[1] Mr. Gooch.

The agriculturists are much indebted to Mr. Curwen for his exertions in their behalf.

We observe that the Earl of Liverpool in his speech in the House of Lords, on 26th of February, laid great stress on the fact of the agricultural interest being in an equal state of depression in other countries very differently circumstanced from our own, and as a consequence of this discovery, argued that taxes had not caused the depression in this country, but that it had arisen here as elsewhere, from superabundance of produce. If all this be granted, what does it avail him?—Taxes, he will not deny, aggravate the distress.—We have the means.—It is in our power,[1] from the blessing of an existent high taxation, to relieve the agriculturists in this country. (Happy Britain, that can thus derive advantage from being highly taxed!) There is certainly no denying, that if seven or six millions of taxes were to be taken off, if the amount levied from each acre of ground were to be reduced from 3*s*. 6*d*. to even 3*s*. only, it would be a grant bonus to the landed interest.

This the poor farmers are not so ignorant as not to see, though they are not sanguine enough to expect such a relief from the present ministers, or such sort of independent gentlemen as Messrs. Gooch, S. Wortley, Wodehouse, and D. Acland or Bankes.[2]

So Mr. Gooch "has listened[3] to all the arguments in favor of the two Lords of the admiralty, and is perfectly persuaded that there is no necessity for them." What ought the public to think of him and the other independent country gentlemen, as they call themselves, who have annually voted that ministers could not do without them? No fresh reason has arisen this session for their discontinuance—they were equally unjustifiable appointments six years ago, yet he and those other mirrors of patriotism, whom we have often enough had occasion to name in this pamphlet, thought the relief of the country, as long as the landed interest was thriving, or likely to thrive, a very secondary consideration, to the keeping in of their own party:—were these men, we ask, actuated in their conduct on Friday last, by principle, or constrained to turn their backs upon themselves, by the combined influence of selfishness and shame? They cannot pretend that any new circumstances, before unperceived by them, are now exposed—and can they explain to their constituents why they have for six years obstinately supported all the extravagance of ministers? It is distressing to reflect on their conduct; and now we suppose they will argue that the House of Commons clearly[1] represents the country, inasmuch as it has begun six years after an universal petitioning for relief, and when the personal interests of the majority in the house are vitally affected, to second the public voice by voting for a reduction in the Admiralty establishment. The impression the late divisions on Lord Althorp's motion, and on Mr. Calcraft's motion for repeal of Salt tax,[2] have made upon the country, may be learned from the following resolution at a Cambridge county meeting.

---

[1] Lord Londonderry will not surely miss this opportunity of urging how evidently preferable is a state of heavy taxation, and how justly he described us as "ignorantly impatient" of this great advantage.

[2] Mr. G. Bennett, in reference to this last-mentioned member, made the following apposite remarks in a late debate. "He should like to see Mr. Bankes present himself at one of those county meetings; (hear, and much laughter)—which, in his usual manner, he had in so sneering a way adverted to: for he would venture to say, that no greater detection of the character of a human being ever yet took place, than in such an assembly would be made, of the character of the honorable Gentleman. He would find that the jury of public opinion was of a very different nature from a jury of Parliament; (hear, hear)—and that if his real character was made known, instead of his being held up, as he (Mr. Bennett) had with astonishment so often known him to be held up, in that House, for the advocate of retrenchment, and of political improvement, he would be told, that while he watched with a patient and scrutinising eye the appropriation of a few paltry pence, or shillings, he gave his aid to an unlimited squandering of guineas: he would, in a word, be at length discovered to be a staunch supporter of the Government in every measure of immoderate expenditure; however he might at times have been the advocate of some petty system of insignificant retrenchment." (Hear, hear.)

[3] Mr. H. Sumner did not vote for the reduction of the two Lords of the Admiralty.

"CAMBRIDGE COUNTY MEETING.—A numerous meeting of the freeholders and inhabitants of Cambridgeshire was held on Thursday, pursuant to a requisition to the High Sheriff, 'to take into consideration the present disastrous state of the agricultural interest, and the propriety of petitioning parliament for relief.'—Mr. Pryme moved resolutions for a petition to Parliament for relief.—The Rev. G. A. Brown doubted the expediency of a petition without some mention of reform.—Mr. F. K. Eagle, after a short address, moved as an amendment to the original resolutions—

"'That from what has taken place during the present and preceding sessions, it is the firm and decided opinion of this meeting, that any petition to the lower House of Parliament, as at present constituted, for relief from the difficulties under which the nation is sinking, would be entirely vain and fruitless.'

"Mr. Samuel Wells seconded the amendment.—Mr. Beals read a letter written by the Duke of Bedford, in which the noble Duke declared that it was useless to petition the House of Commons as it is now constituted, for their petitions were year after year disregarded, and thrown aside as waste paper. The High Sheriff put the amendment, which was carried by a considerable majority; consequently the resolutions for a petition fell to the ground.—Thanks were voted to the High Sheriff, who returned his acknowledgments, after which the meeting was dissolved."

---

[1] We must not be misunderstood. That the House of Commons represents the country, *possibly might be* ARGUED from other premises: but we deny that any such conclusion can be drawn from the division of Sir M. W. Ridley's motion.

[2] Mr. Gooch and Wodehouse voted against the repeal of Salt tax.

We have only just lighted on the following defence of his parliamentary behavior, made last session by Mr. S. Wortley, on the debate on the Agricultural Horse tax. Though it is out of place here, we cannot avoid presenting our readers with it.

Mr. S. Wortley said, "he did not think himself liable to the charge of inconsistency which had been made against those who voted for the Estimates and not for the tax. The honorable member for Aberdeen made his propositions to the house founded on his own statements, which were contradicted by ministers. Now here were two parties whose statements were opposed to each other; and he (Mr. W.) and his friends had been in the habit of giving their confidence to ministers. This he took to be a very different case to the repeal of a tax, where every man exercised his own judgment as to its necessity."

Was it not possible then to vote for economy and retrenchment without blindly confiding in Mr. Hume? Did it follow, as a natural consequence, that because Mr. Wortley preferred ministers to the member for Aberdeen, he must not "*exercise his own judgment as to the necessity*" for those large establishments, and that profuse expenditure, which were so universally complained of? Could he not of himself have proposed *from time to time, some reductions on the Estimates*? His constituents have long ago been satisfied, that an obstinate determination to gratify his own vanity, at the expense of their interests, by upholding ministers through thick and thin, has been the only cause which has incapacitated him from the performance of such a duty.

The printer will not give us time to do justice either to Dr. Phillimore or Mr. C. W. Wynn. The Times newspaper has called the public attention to the *consistent* vote of the former against the repeal of the salt tax, and we shall have something to say in our next number on the absence of the latter from the debate on Sir M. W. Ridley's motion.

In the mean time, we take leave of our readers, and fondly indulge in the pleasing persuasion that we have undertaken a work not unworthy of their patronage.

END OF NO. XXXIX.

THOUGHTS

ON THE

PRESENT SYSTEM

OF

ACADEMIC EDUCATION

IN THE

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

By EUBULUS.

> Ne forte putes, me, quæ facere ipse recusem,
> Cum recte tractent alii, laudare maligne. Hor.

LONDON:

1822.

VOL. XX. *Pam.* NO. XL. U

THOUGHTS,

&c.

The return of the annual season for taking A. B. degrees, has led me into a train of thinking, productive of so strong and forcible conviction to my own mind, that I wish to lay the result before others also. In so doing, I am aware that I am adopting a measure, pregnant perhaps with important consequences, likely to excite clamour and ill-will from some, and to be received with jealousy by others; to be railed at by the violent, and deprecated by the timid; which must encounter the prejudices of some, the distrust of others, and the criticisms of all. For all this I am perfectly prepared; because I know that this collision of opinions is most advantageous to the cause of truth, and because, having myself no end to gain, no party to serve, and no ambition to gratify, I consider free, public and unrestricted discussion, as advantageous and even necessary to the objects of my inquiry. That inquiry, I hope myself to pursue with temper and moderation, and if it should excite anger or asperity on the part of my antagonists, I trust I shall neither resent nor retaliate. Indeed it is not very likely that I shall reply. I am too much engaged with other concerns to take an active part in controversy, and the end I propose will be sufficiently answered in having thus opened the way to discussion. Others may carry it on, and in an University containing so great a number of able men, it is not *very* probable that the question will soon be suffered to fall asleep.

The inquiry which I wish to make, and to see pursued, is this, Why is the examination for degrees, why are the honors, and, generally speaking, the rewards and patronage of the University, confined so *exclusively* to mathematical pursuits?

Mathematics are, no doubt, a high and important *branch* of study. They are a science closely concerned in the investigation of abstract truth, requiring intensity of attention, accuracy of research, acuteness of application, and severity of judgment; they are intimately connected with the most useful arts, and with the sublimest speculations; with those inventions which give man power over the world in which he is placed, and with those discoveries which elevate him to the knowledge and contemplation of the worlds beyond and around him. With this admission, cordially and willingly made, no man can fairly accuse me of depreciating or undervaluing the importance of mathematical studies, although I may still make it a question why they should be so *exclusively* pursued. Let us come at once from speculations to facts.

On an average for the last three years, 146 men enter the senate-house annually, at the usual degree time.[1]

Of these, 52 obtain honors: of whom 19 are wranglers, or proficients in mathematics; 19 are senior optimés, or second-rate[2] mathematicians; 14 are junior optimés, or smatterers.[2]

What are the remaining 94? What have they *to show* for an education of three years and a quarter, at an expense which cannot be short of 700*l.*? What have they *got* in religion, ethics, metaphysics, history, classics, jurisprudence? Who can tell? for, except the short examination of one day in Locke, Paley, and Butler, in the senate-house, the *University* must be supposed to know *nothing* of their progress in these things. Their *University examination* for their degree is in *mathematics*, and if they have got four books of Euclid (or even less), can answer a sum in arithmetic, and solve a simple equation, they are deemed *qualified* for their degree, that is, the University pronounces this *a sufficient progress*, after three years and a quarter of study.

So much for the *Πολλοὶ*, the *vulgus ignobile* of the mathematical students, among whom I include what are commonly called gulph men—that is, men who *can* answer and *will not*, and who are therefore entitled to no distinction in the view now taken of an University *examination.*

Let us look back to those distinguished with academic honors.

Of the junior optimés, do *any* bring their reading in mathematics to after use?

Of the senior optimés, do any *two* in each year keep up or pursue their mathematical learning, so as to make farther proficiency in it after they have taken their degree?

Of the wranglers, do many of the lower wranglers, and all, or nearly all the higher, pursue their mathematical studies farther than to qualify for fellowship examination, which at some Colleges, as at Trinity for instance, is partly mathematical? In fact, do more than two-thirds of the wranglers pursue their mathematical studies after they have taken their degrees?

If they do not, then all the fruits of three years and a quarter's study, and all the expenses of 146 men, amounting to above

---

[1] It is evident, that if I had taken into account either the year 1818, or the present enormously large year, the result of these calculations would have been far more striking in my favor; but I seek truth, and do not wish merely to make out a case.

[2] I use plain terms, without intending to convey any reproach. In an inquiry of this sort, we must look to *facts*, not *compliments*.

100,000*l.*, are concentrated, as far as any literary benefit results from them, in about a dozen or fifteen individuals.[1]

Of these individuals I cannot be supposed to speak or think disrespectfully, when I ask, of what *use* to them are their mathematics, without the walls of the University, in common life?

How many Cambridge mathematicians distinguish themselves *by bringing their mathematics to bear* upon the useful arts?

Is it true that they, generally speaking, turn their mathematics to any account, except that of speculative amusement, or academic contention?

They may be, and no doubt they often are, very ingenious and acute men, but does that ingenuity and acuteness, for the most part, *tell*, to any great moral, or political, or social purpose?

Are not, in fact, the greater number of calculations and combinations by which mathematics are brought to bear upon the arts, made by men who have not received an academic education?

Are not *practical* mathematics the great source of useful inventions; and are not the Cambridge mathematics almost *exclusively speculative?*

Take a junior or senior optimé, or even a wrangler, into an irregular field with a common land-surveyor, and ask them severally to measure it; which will do it soonest and best?

Let one of each of these academic graduates and a practical sailor be sailing towards an unknown coast; which will soonest make a correct observation?

Build a bridge across the Thames; who will do it best, Mr. Rennie (supposing him still alive), or a committee of senior wranglers?

If it should happen that in these cases the *practical* mathematicians would have the advantage, may it not be said, that *our* mathematics are more for *show* than *use?*

It may be urged, that we point out the *principle*, and leave to others the *practice*. This may be very true; but I believe the laugh would be a good deal against the speculative academic, who was beaten by the practical clown; and though I admit that ridicule is no test of truth, there would, in this case, be a good deal of reason on its side. I can see no grounds for neglecting *practice*, because we understand *theory*, and if we profess to make mathematics our prime pursuit, surely we ought to comprehend not only their *principles* but also their *application*.

---

[1] It is evident that this calculation is greatly under-rated. 700*l.* is, I fear, considerably under the average amount of the total expenses of an University education, and there are a considerable number of men who take their degrees at bye-terms, very few indeed of whom ever think of reading more than is absolutely necessary for their degree, which is, I will not say how *much*. A nearer calculation would be, to allow at least 800*l.* for the expenses of education, and to add 24 men to the average above-mentioned, making the whole number 170, the sum total of whose expenses therefore is 136,000*l.*

Enough of this.—Let me be permitted to make a few observations on the examination itself, especially that which respects the higher class of honors.

Ever since the days of Samson, riddles have been thought a great test of the acuteness of the human mind. After the time that he puzzled the Philistines, the sphinx puzzled the Thebans, and the Queen of Sheba tried to puzzle Solomon. And, in conformity with this custom, in which sacred and profane histories alike concur, after a lapse of between three and four thousand years, the examiners in the senate-house still propose *riddles* to their examinants.

What *is* the greater part of that examination but a set of mathematical conundrums, in which each examiner tries to display his ingenuity by quibbling subtleties, by little *niceties*, and *knackeries*, and *tricks* of the art, which are for the most part exceedingly clever, and exceedingly unprofitable, and which bear a close, I may say a *very close* affinity to those hair-breadth theological and metaphysical distinctions, which baffled, and perplexed, and expended in the most abstruse and idle speculations, the intellectual faculties of schoolmen and Aristotelians in the middle ages?

Alas! all *their* labors are now considered but idle paradoxes and waste of pains.

What will future ages say of *our own*?

Stultus labor est ineptiarum.

We have even deserted the track of geometry, and forsaken the path our mighty master trod. In that very University whose pride it was to have produced that man who surpassed the race of mankind in intellect, his own labors are neglected, and his own gigantic discoveries no longer occupy that proud and pre-eminent station which is due to their intrinsic merit, and to his immortal name, to national honor, and to academic veneration. A new *fashion* in mathematics is introduced, and one, which in some respects seems less calculated to attain the end for which mathematical studies are supposed to be pursued, by detracting from the *closeness* of geometrical investigation.

Venimus ad summum fortunæ. We can go no farther in the old school. We must have new refinements, new quirks, new capriccios of ingenuity, to satisfy the restless impatience of ambitious minds. We must gain distinction by a new track; the *vetus orbita* will serve no longer; it is too much worn; a man is buried in the ruts, and cannot rise out from them to any eminence of distinction. We must, from time to time, strike out a new path, in which the love of novelty and the love of fame, those two bright coursers of etherial breed, may bear us above the heads of our contemporaries.

But there is one melancholy fact; a certain indication of incipient decay in any people, is when their refinements begin to be *excessive*. As soon as the true and legitimate standard of taste and judgment, either in morals or science, is exceeded, it is even more difficult to *retrograde* towards perfection than it was before to ascend to it. It is hard, indeed, to save ourselves, when, having climbed up the mountain on one side, we have begun to topple down the precipice on the other.

There is another point well deserving our consideration, on which I have not yet touched. Suppose mathematics not to be the *exclusive* branch of academic examination in this University, would there be any deficiency of great and eminent mathematicians? I cannot conceive, that were a *fair and due* degree of honor given to mathematical pursuits, without an *exclusive* preference, there would be any want of persons sufficiently inclined to cultivate and excel in them. I do not know, and I do not believe, that in the days of Barrow, Newton, and Cotes, the same *exclusive* attention was paid to mathematics as at the present time, nor do I conceive that any modern names can be disgraced by a comparison with these. The same stimulus which was *then* sufficient to produce a Newton, would always operate to produce one, although there were no exclusive preference given to mathematics, and no exclusive rewards.

A university is a society of students in *all and every* of the liberal arts and sciences. How then can that society deserve the name, which confines its studies almost entirely to *one?* This exclusive preference militates against the very spirit of our institution, and certainly damps the ardor and cramps the genius of many a man who might excel in classical or metaphysical pursuits, by compelling him to adopt a course of study for which he has neither talent nor inclination, but in which he is *compelled* to delve and toil, if he wishes to attain any academical reward.

Such an one hath the curse of Adam entailed upon him with bitter severity:

> In the sweat of his brow doth he eat bread.

In truth, it is a known and acknowledged fact, that the severity of the senate-house examination, and the dryness of mathematical pursuits, induces many men, even after one or two years' trial, or even more, and after having with infinite toil and labor made some progress on their cheerless way, to abandon all competition for mathematical honors, and content themselves with barely getting their degree.

Of what use are all their studies to *them?*

It may be said, that they have themselves only to blame, and that they might, and should have persevered: and this is true in the abstract, but, like many theories, fails in the application.

With human beings, allowance must be made for human failings and imperfections, and if the mind sinks under the load that is laid upon it, they who lay that load are not, themselves, exempt from blame.

What then do I advise? The relinquishment of mathematical pursuits? By no means. I would give equal *honor*, nay, concede all that can fairly be conceded to long established habits and prejudices; I would give *precedence* to mathematical studies, but not *exclusive privileges and rewards.*

Nec nihil neque omnia.

I would give a large and liberal share of honors and rewards to classical studies, not only in the distribution of classical prizes at present existing by the benefactions of various founders, but in the senate-house examination, and in the classification of academic degrees.

Hear Ye!

I have heard from the examining chaplains of some bishops, a remark, which I believe is pretty general, and which, as I am persuaded most of the members of this University will understand it sufficiently by this allusion, it is unnecessary to place more prominently on record. The only objections which have been made to the establishment of a public examination at the end of the second year, in which a certain knowledge of the Greek Testament and the principles of religion should be a *sine qua non* towards passing for the senate-house degree, have rested on the interruption such an examination would give to the higher reading men, in the mathematical pursuits. I am sorry to think such an objection should be urged by men, whom I believe to be very sincere Christians, and very good, and in all respects where prejudice does not operate, very wise men. But, in this instance, I confess I think them influenced by partiality for usage now some time established, and for their favorite science and pursuits.

What would be thought of a man who should assert, that it was much better to be a good classic than a good Christian? That it would be a pity to read the Greek Testament, lest it should interrupt his study of Aristophanes? And what right have mathematical studies to an exemption, which would not be granted to a student in classics, or any other branch of learning?

But granting that such an examination would cause a short interruption to mathematical pursuits, which is granting more than is necessarily due, what *injury* would it be to *any*, since the interruption would be *alike* to *all?* It would give no undue advantage to one above another, since *all* must submit to it; and supposing it occasioned *all* to know a problem or two less, would any *real* evil result from this defect, or any inconvenience, which would not be counterbalanced by great and substantial good? Admit, which is a great deal more than is ever likely to happen or be proved, that it prevents A. from being senior wrangler, then B. will be senior wrangler instead; and the course of mathematical examination will be just the same, whatever may be the result of it to this or that individual.

So far, therefore, the effect of this minor examination, on that at present in usage for the degree, must be absolutely harmless; but beyond this, the result to every one of the examinants must be productive of great and substantial good, by bringing them acquainted with the grounds and principles of their faith, by leading them to that knowledge, in comparison with which all other knowledge is idle and unprofitable, and guiding them to the search after those truths, in comparison with which all mathematical truth is vanity itself.

I may add, that the beneficial *consequences* of such an examination are incalculable. When the impression is made in early life, and the minds of young men are directed towards the consideration of those great and important truths, which are inseparably connected with the eternal interests of themselves and of all mankind, the impression will never be wholly worn out, there will always be a tendency of thoughts and inclinations to this great object, and the *germ* of Christianity may be preserved, even amidst the temporary allurements of the gayest scenes of pleasure and dissipation. If it springs not immediately, it may in later life; it may at least prove a preservative against the blasphemies of infidelity; and it may guard men from being led, by late repentance, to the extravagances of fanaticism and wild enthusiasm.

On all these grounds, and on many others which might be urged, I see strong and even irresistible arguments in favor of a general preparatory examination. *That* examination should confer no honors, and concede no exemption. It should be plain, perspicuous, and intelligible. No puzzling questions should be asked, because, as no distinctions of honor are granted, no trial of *genius* is necessary. The *majority* of young men educated at this University are designed for holy orders; but even were it not so, every layman who calls himself a Christian, certainly every layman who has received a liberal education in a Christian University, ought to know something of the proofs, history, and doctrines of the Christian religion. The very least that can be required, is a knowledge of the Gospels in their original tongue, the proofs of natural and reavealed religion, and a general acquaintance with Scripture history to the time of the Apostles. I do not pretend to dictate to the good sense of the University, but as a member of it, I may be allowed, without presumption, to state, that I think the Greek Gospels, Grotius de Veritate, and the first volume of Bishop Tomline's Theology, are sufficient for the proposed examination. No burden is laid on any man by requiring an acquaintance with these. It is his duty to know these, and if he does not know them by the time he has been two years at the University, there is infinite blame imputable either to his instructors or to himself.

I know very well what may be alleged about the procrastination of these studies till after the degree of A. B. has been taken; but I do not stop to combat arguments of this sort; they bear their own refutation in themselves, like many of those which may be urged by my adversaries on minor topics. If any of these gentlemen will tell me, that it is of no consequence if a young man of twenty dies ignorant of the truths of Christianity, because there is a chance of his living to know them at the age of twenty-two, I will then say that his tutors may have some excuse for withdrawing his attention to them till he has no farther occasion for their services.

So much for this subject. I am content merely to throw out hints on it, because I have little time for more, and trust these will be sufficient for future exertions. Will it be allowed me to state my own view of the improved system, in the most general terms, leaving the detail and modification of them to the sense of the University?

I would oblige every man, at the expiration of his two first years, to undergo the above-mentioned preparatory examination; and he should then be called upon to declare whether he intended to graduate in mathematics, or classics, which should not preclude him from offering himself for examination in the senate-house in both. In the senate-house examination, the week for mathematics should proceed as usual. That for classics should follow, in which there should be a first, second, and third class, as in mathematics. Let the senior wrangler preserve his pre-eminence, and next to him the first of the first class classics; then the other wranglers, who, in most cases, should not exceed 15, and then the other first class classics, who should not exceed the like number. Next to these, mathematical senior optimés, not exceeding 14; and then second class classics, to the same number. Then the mathematical junior optimés, and the third class classics, whose number should not exceed ten respectively. This would give, supposing each class full, 40 mathematical, and as many classical honors; but it is to be presumed that several men would be ranked in both classes. If the fellowships of the University are distributed with due regard to these honors, no doubt a greater emulation will be excited to excel in both departments.

Σχέδον εἴρηκα. But I must add a few words on the classical examination. It would of course comprise not merely the construing Greek and Latin, but a variety of questions connected with the passages selected, and depending on history, antiquities, chronology, geography, metrical and philological criticism, and ancient philosophy. And this leads me to a remark, which will perhaps be unpalatable to some of our distinguished scholars, but which truth compels me not to omit. I mean, that our range of Greek reading is at present too much confined. We labor about the dramatic writers too much, to the exclusion of the rest. We weary ourselves with adjusting iambics, and trochaics, and anapæsts, and twisting monostrophics into choruses and dochmiacs, and almost seem to neglect the sense for the sake of the sound. I do not mean to disparage these labors, which are sometimes learned and often ingenious; but I wish merely to hint, that if these things are *good*, there are also *better things* than these. We must not forsake the critics, philosophers, orators, and historians of Greece, for a mere branch of her poets; and I fearlessly say, without risk of contradiction from the most competent and able judges, that Plato, Aristotle, Xenophon, Thucydides, Polybius, and Demosthenes, afford more improvement to the taste, and purification to the morals, more exercise for thought and reflection, more dignity to the conceptions, and enlargement to the understanding of the student, than all the Greek tragedies that were ever penned. Not that I affect to slight or despise those noble monuments of the Grecian Muse, which are yet left to us in the works of her dramatic writers; but I underprize them in comparison of the mighty names I have enumerated, and think that *too much* is sacrificed to them, if *these* are neglected in consequence. This remark, and all those which have preceded it, will, I hope, be taken in good part by all considerate and thinking men. I wish to offend none; but I am sufficiently aware, that the subject I have handled is of a nature liable to excite the jealousy of some, and awake the fears of others. The attack or defence, however, of these remarks I shall leave to other hands. I appear now, probably, for the first and last time, in the contest. I have said nothing but from an ardent wish for the honor and credit of the University, and the promotion of public good, by directing our studies to great and useful purposes, and enabling the majority of students who come to this place for instruction, to carry something away in one branch of literature, if they cannot in another.

Hear ye!

Cambridge, Jan. 15, 1822.

A
LETTER
TO
THE RIGHT REVEREND
JOHN, LORD BISHOP OF BRISTOL,
RESPECTING
AN ADDITIONAL EXAMINATION
OF STUDENTS
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE,
AND THE DIFFERENT PLANS
PROPOSED FOR THAT PURPOSE.

BY
PHILOGRANTUS.

Cuncti adsint, meritæque exspectent præmia palmæ.

THIRD EDITION.

LONDON:

1822.

TO

THE RIGHT REVEREND

JOHN, LORD BISHOP OF BRISTOL,

MASTER OF CHRIST COLLEGE,

AND

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY.

My Lord,

Having determined to submit to the Members of our University my thoughts upon the propriety of an additional Examination of Canditates for their first degree, as well as upon the different plans which have been suggested for that purpose, I venture to address myself particularly to your Lordship. My apology for taking this liberty must be, the weight and consequence justly attached to your name, arising not only from the high and important situations which you hold, so much to the satisfaction of the public, both in the Church and in the University, but from the judgment, the candor, and the sound sense by which your sentiments and conduct are invariably distinguished. When treating therefore of those studies, in which you have been yourself pre-eminently successful, I am desirous to give my pamphlet some chance of attracting notice, by inscribing it to the personage, whose example ought, of all others, to be proposed as the object of imitation.

The subject, upon which I intend to suggest some considerations, is one of no recent origin: it has been a very prevalent opinion for half a century, or more, that our University would do well to require from its students a proficiency in some other descriptions of knowledge, besides those at present exacted, as indispensable passports to a degree. It is, however, to the different schemes for the improvement of our system, which have been agitated among us during the last four or five years, that I wish to call attention; with the hope of being able, by fairly and fully stating the merits of each proposed course of proceeding, to reconcile in some degree the present discordance of sentiment. The strong conviction of my own mind, relative to the method which ought to be pursued, a conviction arising from long and intimate acquaintance with academical education, encourages me to think that a fair consideration of the matter in all its bearings will lead others to the same conclusion. Besides, the candid and dispassionate manner in which all discussions upon this topic have of late been conducted, forming a contrast to the heats which, we are told, were formerly excited by the proposal of new regulations, while it is creditable to the present state of feeling in our body, holds out the prospect of a result favorable to the true interest of these establishments.

You will probably recollect, that in consequence of a very strong and prevalent wish, that our young men should henceforth be examined, previously to their degrees, in theological and classical knowledge, as well as in mathematics, metaphysics, and ethics, there was appointed about three years ago a *Syndicate*, of which your Lordship was a member, to deliberate upon this topic, and to propose to the University such a plan as appeared most conducive to the object in view. The committee selected for this purpose were persons, in whom the senate was as well disposed to confide upon such a question, as in any of its body: long and repeated were the discussions, and great was the anxiety shown to arrange a scheme, which might answer the intended purpose, and obviate as much as possible certain objections urged from different quarters against the measure. Owing, however, to the great diversity of opinion upon some particulars, and an anxious wish to satisfy every scruple entertained in our community, the proposal resulting from their deliberations fell far short of the general expectation, and did not, indeed, reach the views of the Syndics themselves. Such as it was, it never received either the approbation or condemnation of the senate, being stopped by a negative voice in the *Caput*. Several other schemes, differing materially from one another, have been subsequently brought forward by individuals; but have all hitherto proved abortive. Upon one only have the suffrages of the members of the senate been taken; I mean the plan for examining the students in classics and the elements of theology, and for apportioning honors upon a scale similar to that already established in mathematics: this scheme was proposed in a *Grace* last year, by the Master of Trinity College, then Vice-Chancellor; and, although it met with considerable support, was rejected by a majority of voices in the Non-Regent House. The failure of a proposal, brought forward after frequent consultations with the other leading members of our body, recommended by the high station of the proposer, and still more by his character for ability, discretion, and public spirit, has led many friends of the measure to despair altogether of its success. It is this disposition to abandon the cause, coupled with another circumstance hereafter to be mentioned, which has induced me to send these considerations to the press. My only title to offer to the world my opinions upon such a question, consists in my intimate acquaintance with the studies and the feelings of the young men, during many years spent in the University, in the constant occupation of a tutor and an examiner. Or, if I possess any other claim to be heard, it is the devoted attachment which I bear to our academical institutions, and my unceasing solicitude for their prosperity.

It is not my intention to enter into the details of the different plans which have been recommended for attaining the desirable objects in view. Such an investigation of minute particulars would be invidious towards the gentlemen who have exerted themselves to promote our common object, the welfare and honor of the University: and it would, at the same time, be unavailing; since there will, I think, be no great difficulty in obtaining acquiescence in the *details*, when once persons are brought to agree upon the *principles* of the measure to be adopted. The differences of opinion existing among us on this subject may be reduced to three heads: I speak of,

1. Those who wish for an additional examination of the students, to be followed by Honors, upon a scale of merit, with all its distinctions and gradations.

2. Those who contend for such an examination merely as a *sine qua non;* excluding all honor and distinction of the meritorious.

3. Those who wish that no change whatever should be hazarded.

The third class is, as far as I can judge, the least numerous of the three. Yet from the opposition of opinion between the other two, it has hitherto been successful, and threatens to prevent the meditated improvement altogether. I am convinced that all parties are actuated by the same wish to see our academical system as prosperous and as perfect as possible, though all may not have had equal opportunities of viewing the subject in its different bearings. Several persons, with whom I have conversed, at different times, upon these questions, have experienced a considerable change of opinion, and have gradually become converts to the scheme of distributing classical honors, upon the liberal and unrestricted plan already practised in mathematics: and I am inclined to hope, that a calm deliberation on the real merits of the case, may produce the same effect in others. Avowing myself, therefore, to be a decided advocate for the first of the three plans, I shall proceed to examine the arguments which I have heard alleged by the two other parties, in favor of their own particular views.

First, then, those who disapprove of the projected additions altogether, contend that, under the present system, our University has arrived at unexampled eminence; that this method has stood the test of experience for several generations, and has been found peculiarly successful in calling forth the emulation and laudable exertions of the students. They admit that reading in the classics and the elementary parts of theology ought to be encouraged; but they wish to leave these important and essential branches of the young men's study to the lectures of their tutors, and to private examinations in their respective colleges: they express, besides, apprehensions of the consequences that may ensue, if we once tamper with a system which has made the University of Cambridge the admiration of the country and of Europe. Now I beg leave to subscribe to every thing that can fairly be said in praise of the present system. I not only do not wish it to be impaired or tampered with, but I agree that it is inexpedient even to add to it, without some strong and evident necessity. Upon this ground, therefore, let us discuss the question, and consider whether, by confining ourselves to the present plan, we *do* produce all the good which it is in our power to effect, and which it is reasonable for the public to expect from an University education. Here we must be careful to separate two very distinct points for our consideration; I mean the case of the young man who aspires to honors; and that of him whose views are bounded by the mere acquisition of a degree. In students of the first description, there is no doubt that extraordinary emulation is produced, and a corresponding proficiency secured: the views of the several colleges are in accordance with those of the University, and thus the emoluments of the place are bestowed on those who have deserved its honors. But the fact is, that of the great numbers who resort hither for their education, the majority always find themselves unequal to strive, with any probability of success, for honorary distinctions. The question therefore is, whether the moderate extent of mathematical and moral knowledge, indispensably required for a degree, be a reasonable and sufficient claim to such a title; or rather, whether the University is justifiable in giving this mark of its approbation, which generally serves as a passport into the liberal professions, to persons, the total of whose academical pursuits has not gone beyond this contemptible *minimum* of knowledge?

I beg to be considered as not speaking with desrespect of the subjects themselves, which are now made the indispensable requisites for a Bachelor's degree. The six books of Euclid, Arithmetic, the elements of Algebra, and a moderate acquaintance with moral and metaphysical philosophy, are useful and valuable branches of knowledge, and such as an University ought to encourage: although with respect to the Algebra, I cannot see the propriety of exacting this, as a *sine qua non*, from persons who are not expected to carry their mathematical studies any farther. But it is obvious, that this quantity of knowledge is far too small to furnish any thing like a reasonable occupation for ten terms, passed by the student in his University education. Except in very few cases, the whole may be acquired in less than a year; thus leaving two years and a half to be employed in a way of which the University exacts no account—which valuable period of time is too frequently squandered in idleness, or in unprofitable pursuits.

The inadequacy of this *minimum* of learning, for the objects of University education, is not denied: but they who resist any addition to our present system, contend, that other necessary branches of knowledge ought to be left, as they now are, to the lectures of the tutors, and the systems pursued in the respective Colleges. It is upon this point then, that the whole argument of those, who object to an additional examination, is made to rest; and to this, before we proceed farther, it is necessary to reply. I doubt whether, at any period, the tutors of the University were more able or more sedulous, in the execution of their duties, than at present. In particular, for the advancement of their pupil's progress in study, they evince a zeal and solicitude which every one at all conversant with our University must remark. But they who urge that we ought to look to the instructions of the tutors, as the means of supplying every deficiency of our public system, really expect these gentlemen to accomplish impossibilities. From them the undergraduate receives advice and direction in his studies, assistance in his difficulties, and encouragement to exertion and perseverance; from their lectures he derives information relative to the subjects which he is studying, and is daily called upon to exhibit some results of his industry. But when a young man chooses to follow the seductions of pleasure or of indolence, rather than the exhortations of his instructor, what can the mere lectures effect? Regular attendance on these occasions may, it is true, be enforced; but what is the advantage, generally speaking, of sitting for an hour to hear a lecture upon a subject which has not employed a single minute of previous attention? It is principally to the studious part of his pupils that the duty of a tutor requires him to adapt his lectures: and though he takes all occasions in his power to give encouragement and assistance to those who have neglected their previous opportunities, yet it cannot be expected that the deserving and industrious should be kept back in their progress, in order to accommodate their indolent or incapable contemporaries.

The examinations which take place in the two great Colleges of Trinity and St. John's are, it is true, powerful aids to the systems of tuition in those establishments: and a similar plan has lately been adopted by some of the smaller societies. These College examinations, at which the young men undergo a strict inquiry into their proficiency in all the different branches of their reading, whether classical, moral, or mathematical, are found eminently serviceable to the cause of education. The periodical recurrence of these trials, and the certainty of the honors which await the meritorious, supply a powerful motive and incentive to their daily studies: while the practice of arranging the young men of the same year in classes, and thus distributing credit upon a graduated scale, in proportion to their deserts, calls into exertion every degree of talent, from the highest to the most moderate capacity. The publicity given to these arrangements makes it impossible for any one to neglect the prescribed studies of his college, without incurring discredit and mortification, and at the same time discovering to his friends how much his time has been misemployed. Nevertheless, experience proves, that some *do* encounter this inevitable disgrace of idleness and ignorance, and, having the consolation of companions in the same exposure, proceed in almost total neglect of useful and prescribed studies, with the exception only of that *modicum* absolutely requisite for a degree. Nor do I see how it is possible for this defect to be entirely remedied by any exertions in private colleges, so long as the University continues to grant upon such easy terms that title, which gives to its holders access to any of the liberal professions.

The mention of this topic brings us to the most important, and at the same time the most painful part of the whole question, I mean, the imperfect state of preparation too frequently exhibited by our candidates for holy orders. It has been remarked, I understand, by some of your Lordship's Right Reverend brethren, that at their examinations, the majority of Cambridge candidates appear worse prepared than the majority of those from Oxford. Of the general truth of this fact, so mortifying to all our best feelings, I fear there can be no doubt: it has been my lot to hear the same thing asserted by several Bishops' chaplains, and those too, persons whose academical predilections might lead them rather to disguise than exaggerate any thing discreditable to Cambridge:

> ————————*pudet hæc opprobria nobis*
> *Et dici potuisse, et non potuisse refelli.*

While we are ready strenuously to uphold the true and substantial glories of our University, and to repel unmerited and envious reflections, we must not shut our eyes to a real defect in our system, and one which it is completely in our own power to remedy. Nobody can pretend to doubt the real cause of the mortifying distinction which has been mentioned. At Oxford there *does* exist an examination in the elements of Theology, at which every student must display a competent acquaintance with that essential branch of knowledge, or be precluded from all chance of obtaining his degree. In this one particular, our sister University has an undoubted advantage: she has the merit of making her system of education more directly conducive to the greatest of all objects, an acquaintance with Christian learning. And so long as we neglect such measures as may make this knowledge universal among our students, it will be in vain for us to boast of our unrivalled character both for science and for literature. No reputation of such a description, however well merited, will serve as an apology for the want of 'that one good thing,' which, as it is the ultimate object of all human pursuits, ought surely to be considered with its due importance in the direction given to them at their outset.

We now come to a numerous class of persons, who, influenced, no doubt, by such considerations as have just been mentioned, admit the propriety of instituting an examination in Theology and the Classics; but at the same time object to giving any honors or distinctions at this trial, which may excite emulation among the industrious class of students. They entirely concur with us in insisting, that no one should be allowed to graduate, without displaying to the University some acquaintance with those important studies: but here they stop; and are unwilling to extend this inquiry beyond a *sine qua non*. Such a method would undoubtedly be effectual in removing part of that disgraceful deficiency to which an allusion has just been made: but it would fall far short of the benefits to be ensured by a more open and extended plan, and would disappoint the just expectations of the public.

First, we hear a great deal said about the danger of *innovation* in established systems which, like that of Cambridge, have received the sanction of time and experience. Now I beg permission to observe, that the very proposal just noticed does contain *innovation* of an essential and radical nature; and one whose introduction all admirers of our present system ought peculiarly to deprecate: this is, the principle of banishing, from an inquiry into the proficiency of young men, all rewards to the deserving. The uniform and unvaried practice of this University, from the very formation of our statutes down to the present day, has been that of adjudging honorable distinction to merit. To this leading and peculiar part of its character, we may fairly trace all the utility and all the reputation of our system; it is the main and vivifying principle whence the animation and spirit pervading the body may be said to spring: and against every violation of it, the friends of Cambridge education are called upon to protest. Besides this fundamental objection, there are certain inevitable consequences of this novel proposal, which I am persuaded that its advocates have not sufficiently contemplated. The exclusion of all honor or distinction, the mixing together the ablest and most meritorious students, in the same result with those of the lowest qualification that can be suffered to proceed to a degree, would have the effect of robbing the examination of all the respect and importance usually attached by young men to their University exercises; a feeling which it is highly expedient to maintain. The *minimum* of knowledge, that can be admitted as sufficient, will soon be discovered; and as no credit can be obtained by going beyond this narrow limit (which, by the by, must be far short of what the better part of them have exhibited at their college lectures and examinations,) the whole of the new arrangement will shortly fall into contempt. Indeed, as every inquiry into merit, beyond a moderate *quantum*, will be superfluous, it can hardly be expected that the examiners will give themselves trouble respecting the attainments of good scholars; their main attention must be devoted to the dull and the indolent. Such a plan will, it is true, guard against any cases of gross ignorance, and will secure a moderate attention in every one to certain important subjects, the neglect of which at present does not exclude him from becoming a graduate: but for any thing further its advocates cannot look: and it promises no one advantage that will not be more effectually obtained by the adoption of a scheme of merit, the nature and tendency of which we shall next proceed to examine.

The plan which was last year proposed to the Senate, enacts a full and ample examination in classical subjects, to be followed by an arrangement of honors in three divisions, exactly similar to those of *Wranglers*, *Senior Optimes*, and *Junior Optimes*. By providing that no person shall have a place among the classical honors, who has not already obtained one in the mathematical tripos, it secures the University against a neglect of philosophical pursuits: and by combining an examination in the Greek Testament, in the history, antiquities, and allusions of the Scriptures, and in the evidences of our Religion, and by making a competent acquaintance with these subjects the indispensable requisite for a degree, it ensures that attention to them which ought to be encouraged by a seminary for Christian education. That the establishment of this scheme will prodigiously increase the amount of study and of intellectual acquirement, can hardly be doubted by any person acquainted with the temper of our academical youth, or, I may say, with the principles of human nature itself. By holding out the certainty of appropriate reward to every description of exertion, in an almost exact proportion to the merit displayed, we shall henceforth supply an unceasing motive to the industry of *all* our students, whatever be the diversity of their tastes and their capacities; and shall take away those excuses for the neglect of college studies, which too many are in the habit of alleging to their friends and to themselves. The importance of the matter now alluded to, though it will be recognized by your Lordship, and by those who have ever been engaged in university tuition, may not perhaps strike all readers in the same light: it will therefore not be amiss to explain more particularly the nature of a difficulty which frequently occurs, to disappoint the sanguine hopes entertained of the success of a youth in his academical career.

Many of our students bring with them to Cambridge a very considerable stock of classical knowledge, as well as much fondness for ancient literature: but they soon discover that there are among their numerous contemporaries two or three or more, possessing so decided an advantage in this department, that they cannot reasonably hope to overtake them. Fancying therefore that all avenue to classical honors is closed against them, they feel their ardor damped, and are continually found turning aside from the path of academical study to various trifling pursuits, which are too apt to mislead the taste, and enervate the mind of youth. This is particularly the case with students whose circumstances in life place them above the necessity of obtaining provision by their own exertions: with this description of young men, the authority of their tutor may prevail in procuring attention to mathematical studies during their first year; but after that period, they too frequently discard these pursuits as irksome, merely because they demand steady application; or allege some fancied aversion to such reading, as the excuse for a neglect of the university course. Knowing that they have already obtained a sufficient portion of this knowledge to ensure a degree, and having no other channel of academical distinction open to their ambition, they suffer the greater part of their remaining time to be mispent in useless occupations, or else wasted in idleness, with its usual accompaniments, extravagance and dissipation. There is another description of students upon whom the same cause operates, less disastrously indeed, but still in a manner greatly to be deprecated: I mean the industrious and aspiring scholars, who feel themselves compelled almost to desert those classical pursuits to which their genius and taste are best adapted, and to devote their time exclusively to mathematics, a study less congenial, in which their progress is painful and unsatisfactory. This case likewise may require some explanation. I suppose a young man actuated by laudable ambition, with a determination to realize as far as possible the hopes of his parents and friends, or to acquire those emoluments which are the result of academical distinction; for here it may be remarked, that in the greater part of our Colleges, the fellowships are avowedly held out as rewards to those who have reached the higher class of university honors. Finding, therefore, that there are among his contemporaries some, whose scholarship he cannot hope with his utmost exertions to surpass, he betakes himself to the only open field, that of mathematics; while it frequently happens that the nature of his talents tends strongly in a different direction. Here he perseveres, *invita Minerva,* in laborious efforts to ascend the higher eminences of science; and has finally the mortification to see persons, with scholarship and with industry inferior to his own, invested with greater honors, and preferred in their society to himself. This is neither an imaginary nor an overstated case: it is one which tutors will acknowledge as of frequent and painful occurrence; and to which, under the present system, we are unavoidably exposed.

I trust that these remarks will not be construed into a disapprobation of the existing practice of exacting from every student a certain quantity of philosophical knowledge, and that I shall not be suspected of a wish to countenance the childish and unworthy apology for a neglect of such pursuits, that the person 'feels no taste for them,' 'that they are dry and uninteresting,' &c. In ascending an eminence, a little perseverance is requisite before we can reach the attractive and interesting parts of the prospect: in the mean time the exercise is beneficial to the health and the animal spirits. In the acquisition of almost every science, a similar degree of labor is demanded, before the promised point of gratification can be attained: but to the mathematics this comparison may be applied most appropriately; since not only is the ascent steep and arduous, but the exertion which it demands is peculiarly invigorating to the mental faculties; and the student, long before he has reached the agreeable part of the science, feels its beneficial effects in his strengthened powers of reasoning, of attention, and of memory. In fact, they who complain most of its irksomeness, are the very persons for whom such a mental discipline is most required: their aversion to close and abstract reasoning being a defect which it is the special business of education to counteract. The only just matter of complaint is, that while we recommend and encourage different species of study, we afford an open and liberal scale of rewards only to one: and by this means, the greater part of our students must either be distinguished as mathematicians or as nothing. That the other studies are important and essential to a system of university education, we are all agreed: and it cannot be denied that there are in the nature of young men's minds and capacities very considerable differences, which make a particular pursuit less eligible for one than for another. Were students more generally encouraged to dedicate their principal attention to those subjects in which each is most calculated to excel, it is hardly possible to doubt that a two-fold result would ensue: a much greater number of students would employ their time in the ardent pursuit of knowledge; and their respective acquirements would become more beneficial to themselves, to their professions, and to their country.

Against the adoption of a plan, promising such great and manifold advantages, I hear only one specific objection urged; which is, that it will interfere too much with the system already established, or, to use a colloquial term, that it will hurt the study of mathematics. It is indeed sometimes alleged by those who disapprove of the proposal, that the university already possesses rewards for classical merit in the Chancellor's Medals, the University Scholarships, and the various prizes for Greek and Latin composition; and it is added, that both the Classics and the Greek Testament are subjects of lectures in all the colleges, and in some, of examination. The last fact can never be made an argument *against* a scheme which tends to promote the very same object; it shall however be considered by and by: we must at present advert to the only apprehension entertained respecting the proposed scheme of classical honors, which in point of fact operates to prevent its adoption.

It is, I hope, unnecessary to repeat my sincere and zealous wish to see the study of Natural Philosophy retain its rank in Cambridge unimpaired. Not one of its members feels more delight than myself, in contemplating the character which it has so fairly earned from the successful cultivation of this noble branch of science, But even here I deprecate any thing like an *exclusive* devotion to one pursuit during the important years wherein the taste and principles of a man are to be formed, and a just direction given to his mind. Were we to neglect other matters essential to a well educated person, we should incur the charge of mistaking the means for the end. But I feel convinced that juster views pervade this place; that our members wish to encourage every liberal and useful study, which can exercise the genius, cultviate the mind, and confirm sound principles. A little consideration will show, that all these objects may be effected by the proposed method, without in the least hurting mathematical studies.'

In the first place, let us admit that some persons may be induced by this additional system to read somewhat less of mathematics, while they devote the time, which would otherwise have been so employed, upon other academical studies more suited to their genius and taste; in what respect is the pursuit of science prejudiced thereby? What injury arises to the individuals themselves? What loss results to their college, or to the professions for which they are designed? I declare myself utterly unable to imagine the least; while it is morally certain, that those very per-some will become better informed than they now are, in the most important of all human studies; and it is equally clear, that many other students will, by the same institution, be impelled to efforts in literature and science, who, at present, neglect both the one and the other; and the dominion of idleness and dissipation will be proportionably contracted. But to return to the main ground of alarm, that the study of mathematics will be injured—The proposed plan makes it an indispensable condition, that the student who aspires to a place in the Classical Tripos, must have previously obtained some mathematical honor; and by this provision, it is certain that this species of reading will be *promoted;* and that, too, in a way peculiarly desirable: inasmuch as many persons of talent will be under the necessity of carrying away with them from Cambridge a pretty fair knowledge of the more useful parts of mechanics, optics, hydrostatics, and astronomy, as well as the elements of the Newtonian Philosophy; too many of whom, under our present system, would probably limit their scientific acquirements to the solution of an adfected quadratic, or, at most, to the extraction of a binomial surd. This result is not, and cannot be disputed: and it may be added, that the order of Junior Optimes, which is at present rather shunned than courted, will rise in respectability, when it becomes a passport to the highest classical distinctions. Every one must perceive how important it is that *all* our honors should be deemed respectable objects of ambition.

But if I am not greatly mistaken, the real apprehensions of those who dread injury to mathematical studies, apply only to the high Wranglers, to those who pursue their researches, with so much energy and success, into the *arcana* of science, and who learn to what extent Analysis may be applied to the advancement of Philosophy. Let this fear once be removed, and the point is carried. That the proposed plan will have an effect at all prejudicial to such students, is a position which I strenuously resist. The argument, indeed, were it valid, would tend to prove that the two classical medals are injurious; since of the persons who have obtained these honors, how large a proportion may be found among our highest Wranglers. That great attainments in the classical and philosophical departments may be, and frequently are united, no one is ignorant: and I appeal to your Lordship, as well as to other persons who have excelled at the same time in both these studies, whether the perusal of the finest writers, during a part of each day, be not a relief to the mind and spirits, which prevents the fatigue resulting from uninterrupted exercise in the severer discipline of science. The young man, whose ambition and energies are wholly directed to the acquirement of academical honors, (and to no others is this part of the subject applicable,) will feel himself constantly refreshed and invigorated by this change of pursuit; the alternation of studies is as wholesome to his mind, as that of solid and of light food is to his bodily constitution.

Further to allay the apprehensions of a defalcation in mathematical reading, I beg leave to suggest that, under the joint system, some young men will carry that branch of study much farther than at present. Many will, by taste and previous scholarship, naturally be drawn for the most part to classical pursuits; they, on the other hand, who owing to smaller advantages of school education, or from other causes, find themselves, on their arrival in the University, less able to cope in this field, will continue, as now, to seek distinction in the more exact sciences; the only alteration will be of this kind—the mathematician, seeing formidable competitors in his own college among the aspirants to classical honors, will find greater efforts and a higher quantity of information requisite, to give him a prospect of obtaining a Fellowship. Thus one class of students will devote their principal attention to philosophy, and another to scholarship; while neither the mathematician is at liberty to neglect the classics, nor the scholar to neglect the mathematics: but it is upon his own favorite pursuit that each will mainly rely for success. By this means, three distinct and important advantages will be obtained: 1. A greater proportion of persons will industriously pursue academical studies; 2. this industry will take a direction more conducive to their several improvements: 3. and the society of each college will have a better choice of proficients, both in science and literature.

It must not be replied to this representation, that it is only a sanguine speculation, not built upon experience. The experiment, as far as the more studious class is concerned, *has* already been tried. It is well known that in one of our large colleges the fellowships are disposed of, not in correspondence with the honors acquired in the University contests, but with reference to the collective merits of the candidates, estimated by a joint examination of their mathematical, metaphysical, *and classical* attainments. To this system of encouragement we are, I suppose, to attribute the fact, that the students of that college have, at least during the last twelve years, borne away more than two thirds of the classical honors proposed to the whole University. Certainly, such remarkable and continued success in literature, must be assigned not to accident, but to some great operating cause; since the students of that college do not amount to one fourth of the whole number in Cambridge. But is it observed that, in consequence of this successful devotion to classical pursuits, there have been wanting high mathematicians in that college? On the contrary, we find that, during this very period, about half our mathematical prizes have been adjudged to students of that same society.[1] Here, then, we have a practical instance of the results of that fair competition among the followers of both branches of knowledge, which I have endeavoured to describe. And similar effects must follow throughout the University, as soon as the proposed scheme is adopted; with this distinction, however—the motive for additional industry will then become general, and instead of being confined to those of superior pretensions from talent, it will operate upon all gradations of ability.

In adopting the plan proposed last year to the Senate, there will be found one leading advantage, which your Lordship, and all persons well acquainted with our University, know how to appreciate —a conformity, both in spirit and in detail, with the regulations already established and practised. No new machinery, no untried principles, no deviation from approved customs, is introduced. The arrangement of honors is one to which our members of all ages are both familiarized and attached: the mode to be adopted in the examination is similar to that which is found so eminently successful in the examinations for Chancellor's medals, and for University scholarships. And I must repeat, that we shall be wanting to ourselves, and to the duty we owe our founders, as well as to the just expectations of the community, if we neglect to avail ourselves of those means, which we possess, for exciting our young men to emulation in all laudable and all useful pursuits. No person can enter our Senate House during the days of annual examination for degrees, without feeling deeply impressed with the spectacle of so much zeal as is there exhibited; nor is this seen merely among those who take the lead in the race, but throughout the whole assemblage of perhaps two hundred candidates. Upon the last day in particular, when the decision is approaching which is finally to ascertain their academical fortunes, we may see as much eagerness in contesting a single place, perhaps forty or fifty from the top, as if the competition lay for the rank of first or second Wrangler: so important in the eyes of the youth is our academical system, and so anxious are they to exhibit themselves in it to the greatest possible advantage.

There is another recommendation, and in my opinion a very important one, to be urged in behalf of this addition to our system —*it is desired by the young men themselves.* The scholar ardently longs for a proper field to distinguish himself, and to satisfy the sanguine expectation of his friends; the mathematician does not deny the fairness and the equity of the regulation. I had opportunities of remarking with what delight they, last year, hailed the appearance of the liberal proposals of the Master of Trinity, as well as the disappointment felt at their rejection. In a place of discipline, it is not often consistent with the duty of the superiors to comply with the desires of the governed; but where the public feeling happens, as in the present instance, to take a direction favorable to study and good order, it would be weak policy not to avail ourselves of the circumstance.

---

[1] Upon consulting the Cambridge Calendar, I find that *six* of the *twelve* Senior Wranglers, and *eleven* of the *twenty-four* Smith's Prizemen have belonged to the same society. Its advantage in classical honors during this period appears, by the same authority, to be in a still higher ratio than I have mentioned.

By some persons who read these remarks, a question of this kind may probably be asked—If an institution be really so desirable, and at the same time so free from all sound objection, how can it have happened, that it has never yet been enacted—that the University has continued to deprive itself and the country of such great and obvious benefit? We reply, that it *has* been long and anxiously desired; and that ever since our mathematical system assumed its present form and importance, many people have wished to see a proper balance preserved, by a similar encouragement of other essential pursuits. The difficulty of effecting great regulations in a body, constituted like ours, is too well known. Time, however, the greatest of innovators, has already produced a mighty alteration: I allude to the increased number of our students, which has been for some time past progressive, and within the last ten years has been nearly doubled: nor are there any symptoms either in the state of the country, or in the feelings entertained towards the English Universities, of any material diminution. Had we not, therefore, a variety of other motives conspiring to recommend such an improvement in our plan of education, yet this single consideration might be sufficient. Supposing the system to have been adequate heretofore, for the maintenance of industry and good order among the young men, yet the same becomes inadequate when the number is increased two-fold. This single fact has prevailed with many persons, who were most averse to any change, and has convinced them that the proposed classical examination is required for the purpose of upholding discipline; which, in a place where fourteen or fifteen hundred young men are collected, can never be effectually preserved, except by engaging their time and their attention in liberal and useful pursuits. The enlargement of our scheme of education is therefore as desirable as the enlargement of our buildings for their reception. In touching upon the last point, I cannot help remarking, that although the judicious regulations enacted four years ago, for the lodging-houses in the town of Cambridge, in which about half our students reside, have materially palliated the evil, and produced as great an assimilation to the discipline of a college as the nature of the case admits, yet they can never compensate for the advantage of a society living like one family within the same walls: nor can any regulations remedy the increased expense of university education, necessarily produced by the present mode of lodging the young men. Upon this subject, however, we look forward to an improved state of things: the author of the Grace for Classical Examinations is known to have originated a plan at once spirited and judicious, for increasing the buildings of his own college: and there can be little doubt, but that a measure which has been long demanded by the circumstances of the University, will, after the example has been given, find imitation in some other societies: in this respect, as well as in many other particulars, the spirit of rivalry existing among our different colleges, is sure to promote the general interests of the body. This step will prove more gratifying to the friends of an English system of education, than perhaps any other that could be named; and it will entitle its author to the lasting gratitude, not only of the present, but of future generations.

Our annual examinations for Chancellor's medals and University scholarships have, I readily confess, a powerful influence in promoting the study of the classics. Such is the zeal and industry which they generate, that, as your Lordship, who has long been an examiner on these occasions, will testify, it is not unfrequent to find students of less than three years standing, who exhibit a familiarity with the greater part of the Greek and Latin writers of the purest ages; who, in their imitations of the poets in both languages, performed within three or four hours, show spirit, taste, and correctness, which would deserve praise were they the productions of long time and study; and who add to these acquirements a very extensive knowledge in history, antiquities, chronology, grammar, and philology, and sometimes answer satisfactorily to almost every description of questions upon these subjects, that can reasonably be put to a student. Both the benefit to the individuals and the credit resulting to the University are great; but then the benefit extends only to eight or ten persons at the utmost, belonging to each year, who are stimulated to exertion by the influence of these prizes. Of the effect which is certain to ensue from the proposed liberal and unlimited competition, we have already a strong illustration at the contests for our University Scholarships: here the examiners occasionally mention with honor some able scholars, who come next to the successful candidate; and it is well known that many young men prepare themselves long and industriously for this trial, without cherishing any hopes of the prize itself, but aspiring only to that uncertain and unrecorded honor:

Tantus amor laudum, tantæ est victoria curæ.

What would the effect be upon the generous ambition and ingenuous minds of the youths, were appropriate rewards offered to every gradation of real merit! To confine classical distinctions to *two* persons of each year, is a restriction, the fairness or expediency of which I never yet heard any one maintain. Let us suppose, however, that there was some reason for this precise limit, at the institution of the medals in 1751; it would follow that the four-fold increase of our numbers since that period would make it requisite to extend the distinctions at present to *eight*. But the only equitable rule for limiting the number is the positive merit of the candidates; which differs, as might be expected, very materially in different years. Under the existing system, we must expect to see cases of hardship and inequality in the dispensation of honor; and such your Lordship will acknowledge actually to have occurred. Sometimes students of great talents and great acquirements in every department of classical literature, are dismissed by the University without any reward or distinction whatever, because they fall somewhat short of the two first among their contemporaries: yet it has happened that the persons thus left in the undistinguished crowd, have deserved to stand in the very highest class, both of scholarship and ability, and were every way calculated to confer lustre upon the place of their education. Your Lordship will perhaps recollect that, about four years ago, a proposal was made to the examiners for the medals to remedy this palpable defect, by publishing for the future an order of merit among those candidates, who should be unanimously adjudged deserving of University distinction, according to the manner now practised among the Wranglers: the proposal was well received at the time, nor was any doubt entertained of its receiving the sanction of our Chancellor, who always shows himself interested for the credit and prosperity of the establishment over which he presides: there is reason also to believe that the measure, if adopted, would have been generally acceptable to the University. However, similar consequences will ere long, I trust, be produced by the enactment of the general plan of which we have been speaking:

λόγος γὰρ ἔκ τ' ἀδοξούντων ἰὼν,
κἀκ τῶν δοκούντων αὐτὸς, οὐ ταὐτὸν σθένει.

The examination for the medals will then hold the same relation to the classical tripos, which that for Dr. Smith's two prizes now bears to the mathematical.

As I am not willing to disguise any fact which bears upon my subject, I frankly acknowledge that the proposed system will prove a greater benefit to the small colleges than to the large ones; since in the latter societies, owing to the great number of their students, the examinations do possess an importance, and produce an incentive, which cannot be expected in the same degree, where the competition is more confined. But in a community like ours, it must always happen, that a public regulation will affect some of the societies more than others: and it would be a reflection upon the members of our two large colleges to imagine, that they can be influenced by any such considerations to oppose an enactment, which promises so much benefit to the general cause of University education. It is a mistake, however, to suppose that *they* will not be gainers, and considerable gainers too, by a scheme, which will infallibly raise the tone and standard of industry and of literature throughout the whole body. Besides, as we have already mentioned, experience proves the insufficiency of the examinations even of the large colleges, useful and efficacious as they are, to guard against determined neglect of every thing, except that pittance of knowledge barely sufficient for a degree. It is now proposed to require, at the end of the period of education, an account of the proficiency of each person in all the various studies which his college has already encouraged him to pursue: such a measure, therefore, will prove not an interference, but a powerful auxiliary to the systems pursued in each society. At present, an instructor often experiences material difficulty in prevailing upon his aspiring pupils to study works, even of the most valuable description, which are not expected to conduce, in some way or other, to success at a public examination: and when, in deference to advice and authority, the young man does read such books, it is with haste and impatience, as if under the impression that 'he is losing time.' This is a consequence inseparable from our method of competition; an evil, perhaps, it may be called—but one which can only be remedied by extending that competition to all essential branches of an under-graduate's study. It is an additional recommendation of the plan, that it does not interfere, *in point of time*, with any college system. While adverting to this subject, I may perhaps be excused for mentioning a topic which is now become a piece of academical history; I mean, the proposals of Mr. John Jebb, about fifty years ago, for an annual examination of every student in the University. We have heard it currently said, that these proposals were rejected through the exertions and influence of Dr. Samuel Powell, the Master of St. John's, who had lately instituted similar examinations in his own college, and was unwilling that their beneficial effects, which were immediately felt, should be imparted to the rest of the University; choosing to maintain a sort of monopoly of science and learning at home. Happening to have lately examined the history and details of these proposals, as given by Mr. Jebb himself, I think it right to avow my opinion, that the resistance made to them by Dr. Powell and others, was not only justifiable, but laudable: since their practical result, had they succeeded, must have been, to take all direction of education out of the hands of the respective colleges, and to place it in those of persons nominated in an order following the cycle of proctors (and therefore almost excluding the consideration of their fitness,) who were to have prescribed the studies of each year. There were several parts of this large machinery which, unless the University was very differently constituted in the year 1772, than it is at present, could hardly have been turned to any practical benefit. Several different schemes of reform were subsequently proposed by Mr. Jebb without success; all tending to reduce the whole University into the state of one vast and unwieldy college, but without making any effectual provision for its administration in this altered state. One of these plans, were it to be named at the present day, would meet with loud and unanimous reprobation; I mean, a separation of the noblemen and fellow-commoners from the other students, subjecting them to a different species of ordeal. My motive for mentioning this piece of academical history, suggested by the course of my argument, is a wish to correct some erroneous notions which prevail respecting the conduct of Dr. Powell, a most able, learned, and public-spirited character; who, from the impulse which he gave to academical study, deserves to be recorded as one of the greatest benefactors, not only of his own college, but the whole University.

There are certain incidental benefits to be expected from the institution of classical and theological examinations for degrees, which, though they may not have entered into the calculation of its advantages, strike me as too important to be passed over in silence. First, the office of Examiner, requiring both erudition and judgment, will procure much credit to those by whom it is ably discharged, and will thereby have the double advantage of adding a motive to some of our ablest resident fellows for the prosecution of important studies, and of introducing their merits to the more general knowledge of the world.[1] In the next place, a gradual improvement in the education of youth throughout the kingdom must ensue, not only from the advancement of classical knowledge in the University, whence so large a proportion of the instructors are taken, but from the existence of a better criterion than we now have for estimating the merits of schoolmasters and private tutors. The fashion, so prevalent during the last few years, of committing the whole, or part of a boy's education to gentlemen who take only four or five pupils, makes this, more than ever, a point of importance. At present, a parent has not often any means of appreciating the qualifications of persons to whose care he entrusts his son. It is no trifling recommendation of a measure, that it will procure more certain provision for the meritorious scholar, and will at the same time improve the general state of education.

---

[1] The mode of their appointment, which is proposed to be vested in certain officers holding responsible situations in the University, is guarded against the opposite dangers arising from individual nomination and rotatory succession.

Other arguments might be urged in favor of the proposed scheme; and in particular it might be shown to be more consistent with the original intent of our foundations, and the views of our statutes, than the preponderating encouragement now given to the pursuit of mathematics. But I am unwilling to press the subject to a fatiguing length, and I suspect that enough has already been suggested to convince those who will candidly reflect upon the intrinsic recommendations of the measure. It is now proper to mention the circumstance which has induced me to lay before the public, at this particular moment, some considerations upon a subject so deeply affecting the vital interests both of our academical and ecclesiastical establishments. It is proposed, I understand, to submit immediately, for the approbation of the University, a widely different plan, and one comprising very few of the essential objects which the Grace of the Master of Trinity embraces. I must be permitted to express the sincere respect, both public and private, which I entertain for the quarter whence the new proposal originates; and to disclaim an intention of opposing this or any other scheme which tends, even in a slight degree, to enforce industry among our students. Nor will I omit to express my sense of the liberal and candid feeling, which leads the author of the measure to wish that it may be fully and maturely discussed among us, before the sentiments of the university are taken upon its merits. It certainly is impossible for me to approve some of its provisions, or to think them adequate to what the circumstances of the case demand: but my main apprehension is, lest it should be considered as a substitute for the more efficacious and more constitutional enactment proposed last year to the Senate. Whatever has the effect of intercepting, or even postponing, the adoption of such a measure, I do not hesitate to deprecate as a serious and substantial evil.

The provisions of the new scheme are, I am informed, in substance the following: an examination, during certain days in the Lent Term, of all students who have kept four preceding terms; the subjects to be either one of the Gospels, or the Acts of the Apostles in Greek, and Dr. Paley's Evidences of Christianity; along with a part of one Greek and one Latin author, to be fixed upon and announced at least a year beforehand; the names of the persons examined to be arranged in three classes, each in alphabetical order: and no person is to be allowed to take his degree who had not passed one of these examinations. Now, admitting in the fullest extent all the advantages to which the advocates of this scheme can possibly lay claim, I must observe that it will effect but a very small part of the good to be expected from an enlarged plan, and will supply very few of the *desiderata* which I have endeavored to describe. It will certainly enforce some little attention to study even among the most indolent, during the early part of their residence at Cambridge; an advantage which it is no wish of mine to depreciate. Still it is impossible not to remark, that it leaves the system for almost two years preceding the Bachelor's degree, totally unaltered. The main part of our youth must continue, as at present, to aim at credit in mathematics or in nothing: while the dull and the indolent, knowing that there is to be no further call upon them for either divinity or classics, will think that they have finally got rid of these subjects, and that the renewal of their acquaintance with Euclid and Algebra may safely be postponed till the ultimate examination approaches. It has already been explained, that the period, in which the college system requires to be assisted and enforced by the enactments of the university, is, generally speaking, not the *early* but the *latter* part of the Under-graduateship: and this the proposed regulation leaves untouched. In promoting classical literature, it will have no effect whatever; the subjects of inquiry being considerably less extensive than those of their College Lectures and examinations, will not produce, in the better class of students, any attention to matters which they would otherwise have neglected. It cannot be expected that the addition of two classes (or rather of one class, since several of the projects already alluded to, recommend a separate class for those merely suffered to pass to a degree) will be effectual in exciting much zeal or industry among the young men in their fifth term. In the present state of the University, the total number annually subjected to this Lent examination will exceed three hundred; and as the last class is to comprise those who can barely pass muster, we may reasonably hope that this will always prove the least numerous: and, unless I misapprehend the feelings of young men, they will have little value for a place in the first or second classes, where their names may be found in alphabetical position, upon terms of equality with 100 or 150 of their contemporaries. Nevertheless, I confess my satisfaction at the proposal of an additional class, not from any expectation of its efficacy, but because I consider it as an admission of the principle, that, at Cambridge, no examination ought to be unaccompanied with honorable distinctions of merit; and I am therefore led to hope, that they who have advanced this first step towards rewarding scholarship, will, ere long, consent to a more substantial and efficacious measure.[1] In fixing a public examination in the intermediate space between admission and degree, there are many obvious advantages; but the precise time now suggested for the purpose, appears less eligible than that proposed by your Lordship, and the other Syndics, in 1819. I am well aware of the objections which some persons urge to any such inquiry before the ultimate one, upon the score of its being an interference with the systems of the respective colleges; objections which have considerable weight, though not, I think, sufficient to preponderate against the benefit of enforcing industry among those who never mean to apply for a bachelor's degree; and of preventing any of the others from postponing the day of study till their last year. But whatever difference of opinion may fairly be entertained upon this point, I do not comprehend how any can exist upon the propriety of calling for a full account of a young man's progress at the *end* of his education. Without troubling the reader with a repetition of my former arguments, I must be permitted to ask why all encouragement to the study of the Greek Scriptures, during the two last years of the under-graduateship, is to be abandoned? Why is no motive to be supplied for acquiring a correct knowledge of Jewish history and antiquities, and the peculiar phraseology of the New Testament; subjects which, I can testify from observation, excite as much interest in the student who does attend to them, as any others, either in literature or science? Why should we not invite the young men to read and meditate upon such works as Paley's Natural Theology, and Butler's Analogy of natural and revealed Religion?

---

[1] Since these remarks have been printed, I have seen an altered draught of the new scheme, in which I am sorry to observe that this slight advance towards a distinction of merit is abandoned: it is now intended that there should be no distinction except that of the *tantum non repulsi;* of those 'to whom the examiners *have only not refused* their certificate of approval;' who are to be separated from the rest of their year, and to have their names arranged in alphabetical order. With respect to the portions of Greek and Latin, the Proposal now contains an express caution, that 'this part of the examination shall be so limited, that *every one who is to be examined* may be reasonably expected to show a competent knowledge of *all* the subjects.' It follows, therefore, that the inquiry must be levelled to the very lowest degree of scholarship and capacity which can be 'expected' to exist in any of our students: and of course the two pieces selected must always be from the easiest authors in each language. As the only advantage proposed by such an enactment must be, to detect those who are destitute of that humble degree of school knowledge without which no person ought to have been admitted a member of the University, would it not be better, on every account, that this part of the examination should take place when the students are assembled for matriculation?

It will be no slight benefit to induce the studious of every standing to dedicate the Sunday to some subjects of this description, and remove from them the temptation of employing that day in a similar manner to the rest of the week. For want of such a motive the student who passes his time in the ardent pursuit of academical fame, is sometimes apt to devote the Sabbath to the investigation of Fluents and Series, or to mastering the difficulties of Æschylus and Thucydides. The mention of this point will not be deemed trifling or insignificant by any one, who considers how much any good habit contracted in youth affects the character of the man in every stage of his existence. And surely the habit of consecrating the Lord's day to religious meditation is one, which every duty enjoins us to cultivate, and which cannot be neglected without seriously impairing the character and the hopes of a Christian.

To return to the forth-coming scheme: however inadequate it appears to the great objects which all friends of the University must desire to see attained, it has still my good wishes for its success: since if the enactment once takes place, it cannot fail to receive, ere long, such amendment and additions as will elevate it both in consequence and utility. But my main object is to urge, that whether this measure, applying to the fifth term, be adopted or not; the plan proposed by the late Vice Chancellor for examining the students immediately before their Bachelor's degree, in classics and theology, is no less desirable and requisite. The two schemes are nearly independent of each other; but the reason of the case points out that a general and fundamental measure should take precedence of one, which embraces a very small part of a young man's studies, and extends to less than half the period of his academical education. I am aware, however, of the feeling of delicacy which prevents any friend of the comprehensive measure from bringing forward a motion, which has been recently made by a person of such high rank and consideration in our body; and while no one else can with propriety take it out of his hand, we must not expect *him* to be forward in renewing a proposal negatived less than a year ago. But should other advocates of the measure concur with me in thinking the present an eligible crisis for its revival, there will be neither difficulty nor impropriety in signifying this opinion to the Master of Trinity: and the public spirit exhibited by that gentleman on every occasion since he came amongst us, gives an assurance of his readiness to embark again in the cause, and to admit such modifications in the details of his scheme as, without altering its principle, may obviate the objections of some, whose long acquaintance with academical matters entitle their opinions to consideration.[1] Of the success of another application to the Senate, my hopes are rather sanguine: I am not quite convinced that even last year the majority were hostile to the measure; nor can this point be easily ascertained, as the question did not reach the Regent House: however, supposing the fact to have been so, yet I have myself heard it avowed by some who negatived the Grace, that their objections were directed, not against its principle, but against some of its details—which may be revised before it is next offered for their suffrages. Besides, I confess that my reliance is great upon the effects of calm and candid consideration: these are already perceptible to no trifling extent; and I feel a confidence, that the good sense and patriotic feelings of our members will not suffer them to oppose any partial and unimportant objections, to prevent a measure fraught with so much general and lasting benefit to the whole community.

It now remains only to make a few general remarks upon the expediency of the plan which I have been endeavouring to recommend. The great improvement in education that has of late taken place, not only among the lower ranks, but in all the different gradations of society, points out the necessity of a corresponding advance in that of the higher order; and for effecting this, the country looks to our academical establishments. This observation applies peculiarly to the Clerical profession, for which more than half our students are destined. For the purpose of upholding, among our population, a proper respect for religion and for morals, and of counteracting the unwearied efforts of the patrons of licentiousness and infidelity, no instrument can be so effectual as a well-educated, enlightened, and zealous clergy. Upon this point much might be urged: but its importance will be admitted at once by the readers for whom these pages are destined. But if this object be of such paramount weight, it surely follows, that some part of the time spent in the University ought to be passed in the pursuit of that Christian knowledge, which will prove to every student the most precious acquisition of his life, and to the majority will be a preparation for the sacred office to which they mean to dedicate themselves. I think the foregoing remarks will have demonstrated, that this object may be attained without our sustaining the least deterioration either in profane literature, or in science: but even were it necessary to make some sacrifice in these respects to a matter of such infinitely greater importance, could we, as conscientious Christians, hesitate to take the step?

---

[1] I shall take the liberty of suggesting one of these points, which occurs to me while writing: this is, that the clause may be omitted which allows the first ten Wranglers, or any other number, to claim an exemption from the classical examination. Unless I greatly mistake the temper of young men, very few, or none, would avail themselves of such an invidious privilege, which would be understood by their contemporaries to imply the acknowledgment of gross insufficiency in literature. In the meantime, the very enactment of such a permission would seem to convey a reflection upon mathematicians, of which they are not at all deserving. How large a proportion of our first-rate scholars may be found within the specified limits of the tripos! I speak from observation when I say that it is very rare to find among us a superior mathematician, who is not also a respectable classical scholar.

One topic only remains. Every body is aware of the spirit of hostility, sometimes amounting to rancour, which has been exhibited against the English Universities by a literary party of most distinguished talent, who derive their own education from the northern part of the island. Their attacks upon these establishments have continued, with little or no intermission, during twenty years, since the first institution of their Journal, and have, indeed, formed no inconsiderable feature in their general warfare against almost all institutions, which peculiarly command the respect and attachment of Englishmen. These assaults have been carried on with the combined weapons of invective and ridicule, and have been directed against our foundations, our principles, our pursuits, our literature, and our science; all which are in turn subjected to the most extravagant misrepresentations. Although these charges have been severally repelled, in a manner which showed our enemies how greatly they had been mistaken in regarding the members of these establishments as objects of contempt, yet in no one case am I aware of their having to complain of retaliation on our parts; no reprisal has been attempted on the academical system of their 'Northern Athens.' At one time, indeed, their operations took a new and a rather alarming direction. Certain leaders of the party, having by their talents procured a seat in the Legislature, carried along with them not only the political, but the literary animosities of their Review; and designed to enforce, by the omnipotence of Parliament, those goodly schemes which their pens had been laboring to effect in vain. This project wanted neither boldness nor address; and being cloaked under a measure of a very different kind, an inquiry into the education of the '*Lower Orders,*' the suspicions of Parliament, and of the country, were not aroused till it was too late. But the scheme, however well laid, was marred by too great eagerness in its execution: the mask was pulled off much too soon: its authors were unable to resist the temptation of exercising their inquisitorial functions in the direction of their personal and political animosities, of searching for means to traduce by slander or insinuation the most respected leaders of the Church, and of insulting and brow-beating some distinguished characters of this University. The consequence of these, and other parts of this notable transaction, was, a pretty close examination into the proceedings of these stern examiners themselves; and never, perhaps, was a sentiment more general throughout the country, than that which pronounced the condemnation of the whole. From that time, they have been obliged to console themselves for their defeat and mortification, by the indulgence of railing personalities against those who had exposed their misrepresentations, refuted their reasonings, and unmasked their projects. However, although any further scheme of an '*Education Committee*' is now abandoned as hopeless, yet the same spirit is still at work; and attempts have been made to undermine the foundations of the citadel, which is found too strong to be taken by assault. Such is the tendency of the plan for compelling future masters of endowed grammar schools to teach English reading, writing, and accounts, as well as the learned languages; by which means, those establishments will shortly cease to be under the care of persons of liberal education and habits, or the resort of the sons of gentlemen: and thus one of the main supplies of scholarship and talent to the Universities will be cut off.[1] The scheme deserves the praise of ingenuity: but its authors could hardly flatter themselves that its tendency would not be detected. They must return to their favorite employment of calumniating or ridiculing the Church and the Universities: and of such favors, the persons who most interest themselves to promote the welfare of their respective communities, are sure to have the largest share. But of these matters no more need here be said—

ὠκέα βέλη
ἔνδον ἐντὶ φαρέτρας—

My only object in mentioning them, is to suggest, that while we repel the false and slanderous charges which our enemies bring against us, we must be careful not to give ground for others which may have a better foundation; and that we cannot be too watchful in repairing the defects which the lapse of time, or the change of circumstances, may have occasioned in our system, whenever it can be done, as in the present case, with due conformity to our established laws and customs. I do not indeed imagine, that the improvement and extension of our system of education will conciliate the personages of whom we have been speaking: any thing which raises the honor, and advances the utility of our Colleges, is rather calculated to increase than to abate their spleen: I remember your Lordship expressing yourself to the same effect when, in one of your Commencement Speeches, you thus hinted at the feelings of jealousy which really actuate our accusers. '*Valde suspicor, si de tacitis eorum cogitationibus fas sit conjectare, non tam inertiam nostram quam diligentiam illis displicere.*' But it is necessary for us assiduously to attend to the objects of our foundation, if we wish to retain the attachment of the country, which has hitherto proved our real strength and safeguard—that '*romantic attachment,*' as they are pleased to term it, which our enemies acknowledge to be the main obstacle to their designs; and which will not desert us, so long as we continue to imbue the minds of the community with sound literature, and with the pure principles of Christianity.

---

[1] This matter is clearly and irresistibly stated in a *Letter to Henry Brougham, Esq. M. P. on certain Clauses in the Education Bill,* by S. Butler, D.D. Head Master of Shrewsbury School.

I now dismiss a subject, which I have purposely treated in the plainest style, as suiting its didactic nature:

Ornari res ipsa negat, contenta doceri.

That my arguments may be successful, is certainly my earnest desire; being myself convinced by long reflection, that their object will prove highly serviceable to the University. Above all I am anxious that they may meet with the approbation of your Lordship; since your own pre-eminence in Theology, in Scholarship, and in Philosophy, affords the surest pledge of your desire to encourage those studies among others; and your discretion and penetration must enable you to form a just view of the method most proper to be adopted. I forbear subscribing my name, because my arguments, if well founded and correct, will prevail without it; nor do I wish them to obtain any credit if erroneous; but in case of their failure, I see no good reason why the name of the author should suffer along with them. However, I beg to assure you, that I use no disguise when I declare myself to be, with the sincerest respect, and profoundest veneration for your character,

My Lord,

Your Lordship's most faithful,

Most humble, and obedient servant,

PHILOGRANTUS.

Cambridge,
Feb. 1*st*, 1822.

POSTSCRIPT.

I HAVE just perused a Pamphlet, which has appeared within the last few days, under the following very precise title—'Thoughts on the Present System of *Academic* Education in the *University* of Cambridge. By *Eubulus*.' The author represents himself to be a member of this University; a fact which his readers would never have suspected, so incredible is the ignorance which he betrays of the real pursuits of the place. He condemns with vehemence the exclusive attention paid to mathematics; and after having settled that not above twelve or fifteen of the graduates of each year pursue their mathematical studies after they have taken their degree, he decides that, to all the remainder of the young men, their total acquirements, and the whole of their University education, are absolutely useless. He then takes up the matter in a financial point of view, and by estimating the expenses of each student at 700*l*. or 800*l*., the result of his calculation is, that from 100,000*l*. to 136,000*l*. are annually expended for no good purpose whatever to any body, except to those twelve or fifteen individuals!

In making this statement, *Eubulus* appears to be ignorant that there exists such a thing as education in the respective Colleges—that any thing but the mathematics may possibly be studied, even by the unhonored class, (whom he is pleased to style *Πολλοὶ*!)—or that any other advantages can be derived from an University education, and the numerous facilities for acquiring useful and interesting knowledge of other descriptions, which this place supplies.

But the most remarkable feature of *Eubulus's* pamphlet is, his complete misapprehension of the real object which the University has in view, when it encourages the study of philosophy among its youth. He does not appear to have the slightest suspicion, that it is intended by this course of reading to strengthen the reasoning faculties, to produce habits of close attention, accuracy, and discrimination, to exercise acuteness, and to improve the memory. The only utility of the study is, he thinks, to promote new discoveries, or practical mathematics: and as this effect is but seldom found to take place even among his twelve or fifteen select worthies, he leaves it to be inferred, that Academic education is totally useless, and all the vast sums expended upon it are thrown away. His arguments upon this subject defy all description; it would be impossible to give an adequate notion of them, except by quoting his own words:

> "Are not *practical* mathematics the great source of useful inventions; and are not the Cambridge mathematics almost *exclusively speculative*?
>
> "Take a junior or senior optimé, or even a wrangler, into an irregular field with a common land-surveyor, and ask them severally to measure it; which will do it soonest and best?
>
> "Let one of each of these academic graduates and a practical sailor be sailing towards an unknown coast; which will soonest make a correct observation?
>
> "Build a bridge across the Thames; who will do it best, Mr. Rennie (supposing him still alive,) or a committee of senior wranglers?
>
> "If it should happen that in these cases the *practical* mathematicians would have the advantage, may it not be said, that *our* mathematics are more for *show* than *use*?"—*Eubulus*, p. 8.

If this gentleman be really a graduate of the University, and if this be the fruit of Cambridge logic, it is indeed an argument that our system ought to be altered without delay. It does not occur to him, that he might as well have asked similar questions respecting most other human studies. Nor has he the least idea that his Senior Wranglers may possibly experience other benefits from their attainments, even if they be not able to build a bridge across the Thames better than Mr. Rennie, ('supposing him still alive!')

1, The inevitable tendency of the doctrine of *Eubulus* is, to show that mathematics ought no longer to be encouraged as a branch of our University studies; since, according to him, they lead to nothing but a prodigal and almost criminal waste both of time and of money. But, strange to say, this gentleman (whose title does not altogether correspond with his writings) is disposed to spare them, useless as they are, and even to allow them the precedence of other studies: in this respect his conclusion is completely at variance with the whole of his argument.

2 He then proposes general examinations in divinity and in the classics: and it gives me some concern to find desirable measures recommended by a writer who reasons like *Eubulus*. He has a scheme for this purpose, some parts of which are original:—First, he would institute an examination in divinity of all students at the end of their second year, which 'should confer no honors, and concede no exemption.' Each of the *Examinants* (such is the name by which he designates the young men under examination!) is then 'to declare whether he intends to graduate in mathematics or classics, which should not preclude him from offering himself for examination in the Senate-house in both.' At the degree-time, he means to have one tripos, or list of honors, in each department, which is on no account to exceed *forty*. Whenever this plan is proposed, there will, I fear, be two fundamental objections to it: first, that it leads to, and sanctions an entire neglect of one or

other branch of knowledge, which it should be the object of our regulations to prevent; and secondly, that it subverts the very principles of our University system, in limiting the honors, not by the merits of the students, (whose number and whose proficiency will vary,) but by a sort of Procrustean rule, to which all cases must be adapted.

My only motive for noticing this pamphlet at all, is to mark with due reprobation its unfair and unfounded statements respecting our present University examinations. For his first complaint, that the mathematical questions are *puzzling*, his readers will perhaps be at no loss to account; he may have found them such; and if so, his case is not an uncommon one, although his manner of describing it is peculiar enough;

> "Ever since the days of Samson, riddles have been thought a great test of the acuteness of the human mind. After the time that he puzzled the Philistines, the sphinx puzzled the Thebans, and the Queen of Sheba tried to puzzle Solomon. And, in conformity with this custom, in which sacred and profane histories alike concur, after a lapse of between three and four thousand years, the examiners in the Senate-house still propose *riddles* to their EXAMINANTS.
>
> "What *is* the greater part of that examination but a set of mathematical conundrums, in which each examiner tries to display his ingenuity by quibbling subtleties, by little *niceties*, and *knackeries*, and *tricks* of the art, &c.?"—*Eubulus*, p. 9.

How true

But he continues, in the same strain, to declare 'that we have deserted the track of geometry, and forsaken the path our mighty master trod;' in short, that 'the labors of Newton are neglected' at Cambridge. Now that this is inconsistent with fact, every body, at all acquainted with the place, will testify. It may be true, that within the last six or seven years, too much stress has been sometimes laid upon the French analytics; but not in any degree which can justify the statements of *Eubulus*.

In the Senate-house examination which has just taken place, I have reason to believe that as much inquiry has been made respecting all parts of the *Principia*, as the most zealous Newtonian could wish. And the late appointment of Professor Turton to fill the chair of our immortal Philosopher, while it affords the utmost satisfaction to all friends of the University, gives us a security, that the philosophical studies of our youth will receive the most judicious and most useful direction.

But let us admit, that for his last complaints, however overstated, he may have had some sort of foundation: for another of his reflections upon our system, *Eubulus* has not a pretence or shadow of justification: in his nineteenth page, he is pleased to pronounce,—

> "That our range of Greek reading is at present too much confined. We

labor about the dramatic writers too much, *to the exclusion of the rest.* We weary ourselves with adjusting iambics, and trochaics, and anapæsts, and twisting monostrophics into choruses and dochmiacs, and almost seem to neglect the sense for the sake of the sound."

Where did *Eubulus* learn this? What single instance can he produce to countenance this bare-faced assertion? I must, in candor, suppose that he is really ignorant of the matter on which he writes: but had he made the least inquiry, he would have found that the dramatists occupy no larger share of attention than their excellence and their extent demand; and that the study of the poets and the prose authors is equally encouraged. I have always heard it remarked, that the peculiar merit of our classical examinations consists in the care taken that no department of literature should be neglected: by allowing full credit to all, they encourage the youth in the free pursuit of those models, which can best form the taste, enlarge the mind, and purify the judgment. *Eubulus* recommends other authors, which he complains are excluded, and specifies Plato, Xenophon, Thucydides, Polybius and Demosthenes; fixing upon books which do happen to be as frequently, or possibly more so, than any others, the subjects of examination!!! As for his sentence about metre, (which sounds as if it were taken from the Edinburgh Review,) I shall not stop to conjecture what his own conceptions may be of '*monostrophics*,' or of '*choruses, and dochmiacs*;' but I will ask him, whether ever he heard that at any classical examination (and of such he is speaking) the students were called upon to exercise their ingenuity in 'twisting' compositions of that description? Or, if this be a sheer piece of invention, how can he reconcile to any honorable feeling, the having put forth such groundless and pitiful insinuations; which he thinks will be discreditable to the University, and to which he means that his character of one of its members should give currency?

There are, in *Eubulus's* pamphlet, two or three sentences respecting the pursuit of Christian knowledge, which I so cordially approve, and which appear so honorable to the writer, that I would have forborne to notice the weakness of the rest of his performance, had he not called for this mention of him, by such unparalleled misrepresentations of our University; for which it is difficult to imagine either provocation or apology.

Reed

A

LETTER

TO

PHILOGRANTUS,

BY EUBULUS:

BEING

A SEQUEL TO A PAMPHLET,

ENTITLED

THOUGHTS

ON

THE PRESENT SYSTEM OF ACADEMIC EDUCATION

IN THE

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

——— me lectori credere malo
Quam *Professoris* fastidia ferre superbi.

"A false quantity, a direct insult to all the laws of prosody! But we cannot expect gentlemen who do not *weigh* their words, to be very exact in *measuring* their syllables."

"Take physic, Pomp."

LONDON:
1822.

TO THE

VERY REVEREND

JAMES HENRY MONK, D.D.

DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH, &c. &c. &c.

Mr. Dean,

I do myself the honor of inscribing the following pages to you, knowing the ardor with which you advocate the same cause I have myself, however feebly, attempted to promote. A second reason, which has induced me to take this step, is the reputation you have obtained, of being an occasional contributor to the Quarterly Review. Every writer, in a work of such importance, as one of our first Literary Journals, must be above all unfair and illiberal arts of criticism,

Cum tabulis animum censoris sumet HONESTI.

He will not spare the lash, where dulness and folly, much more where wickedness and immorality require that it should be inflicted; neither will he give unnecessary pain to the unoffending, or treat the mistaken, but well-meaning, with wanton severity; still less will he superciliously sneer at what he cannot refute, or wilfully misrepresent the words or arguments of the author submitted to his judgment, to gain any triumph, or serve any purpose of his own. These are some of the requisites, among many others, essential for a man to possess, who undertakes so respectable an office as that to which I have alluded, and which, I hope, it is no offence to say, that you are reported sometimes to have discharged. Whether there be truth or not in those reports, I trust your indignation, as a scholar and as a man, will be excited at the disengenuous conduct which a writer, who calls himself Philograntus, has manifested towards me; and I therefore beg leave to dedicate the following pages to you.

I am, Mr. Dean,

Your very obedient Servant,

EUBULUS.

London, March, 1822.

A LETTER,

&c.

Sir,

In the Appendix to your Pamphlet, on the Present State of Cambridge Examinations, I find some strictures, written with a good deal of asperity, upon a recent publication of mine, on the same subject. I lament this, not indeed for my own sake, because I perceive that your observations are founded in misconception; but because I fear this strongly avowed hostility may injure a cause, in which I am quite as ardent as you can be, and because I see no reason why men of literary pursuits should express themselves contemptuously of each other, even when they happen to differ, much less when, in many respects, and in all main points, they agree in opinion.

You may possibly be incredulous on the subject; but, were I disposed to retaliate, and especially to make short and unfair selections, without the context, I am convinced I could point out more and greater faults and blunders in your pamphlet than in my own. You have fastened on a word, in defence of which, I might say more than appears to occur to you, but which I will at once admit I might as well not have used in this instance, I mean *examinant*, which, I presume, you, deriving it from the present participle, consider as equivalent to *examiner*, not to one who is under examination; or, if I may be allowed for a moment to coin a word, without being criticised for it, to one who is an *examinand*. Let me allow it to be a slip of the pen, which you and I, and men much greater than either of us, are, and always have been, liable to. The general language of my pamphlet, I am sure, is not so coarse and rude as to justify your producing this one word as a fair specimen of the whole. I could, and if your reply to this letter is what it should be, *I will* show you a much greater slip of Dr. Richard Bentley, whom, I trust, you will not be offended at my placing a few degrees higher than you or myself, or any score of our equals. But to take only one word of your own pamphlet, let me ask you, by what possible analogy you justify even the name you assume? Is Philo-Grantus a lover of Granta? Then, I suppose, Philo-*Romus* is a lover of Rome, and Phil-*Athenus* a lover of Athens. I mention this, not with any motive of ill-will, nor with any view to snatch a paltry triumph; but merely to show you that every writer, however practised (and perhaps I have had some experience myself) is liable to occasional slips of the pen—the paucæ maculæ—

> ——— Quas aut incuria fudit
> Aut humana parum cavit natura.

My wish being to promote the same objects with yourself, my present address to you is written with a view to show you wherein you have totally misunderstood and misrepresented, I might rather say perverted, my meaning; and I shall rejoice if I succeed in bringing that conviction to your mind, because I am quite sure that such a conviction *ought* to be there, and think it also very material to the interests of the great cause which we both have at heart, that its advocates should not quarrel among themselves. Before I proceed, however, on the subject, allow me to say, (and I assure you I mean no offence in it) that I am wholly at a loss to account for the apparent warmth and hostility with which you have attacked me, unless it be that you have understood my pamphlet has given offence to some of our principal opponents, and think to propitiate them by sacrificing me. I can hardly imagine any other grounds than some view of policy like this, for so much warmth and so much misapprehension.

You state that I condemn *with vehemence* the exclusive attention paid to mathematics. I am at a loss to know what greater vehemence is in my language than your own. I put it to your own candor, to read my language in the two paragraphs, p. 4.

"The inquiry which I wish to make, and to see pursued, is this, Why is the examination for degrees, why are the honors, and, generally speaking, the rewards and patronage of the University, confined so *exclusively* to mathematical pursuit?

"Mathematics are, no doubt, a high and important *branch* of study. They are a science closely concerned in the investigation of abstract truth, requiring intensity of attention, accuracy of research, acuteness of application, and severity of judgment; they are intimately connected with the most useful arts, and with the sublimest speculations; with those inventions which give man power over the world in which he is placed, and with those discoveries which elevate him to the knowledge and contemplation of the worlds beyond and around him. With this admission, cordially and willingly made, no man can fairly accuse me of depreciating or undervaluing the importance of mathematical studies, although I may still make it a question why they should be so *exclusively* pursued. Let us come at once from speculations to facts."

Surely there is no vehemence of condemnation in a simple question, which the first of these paragraphs contains, or in the praise freely given to mathematical studies in that which follows.

In turning to your own pamphlet, p. 20, I find much the same sentiments; and, though your language is undoubtedly temperate, I do not see that it is in any respect more so than mine.

You then state, "that, after having settled, that not above twelve or fifteen of the graduates of each year pursue their mathematical studies after they have taken their degree, I decide that, to all the remainder of the young men, their total acquirements, and the whole of their University education, are absolutely useless."

This, Sir, to use one of your own expressions, is "an unparalleled misrepresentation." My words are, "their *University examination* (and these two words are purposely printed in italics) for their degree is in mathematics," &c.; meaning, thereby, that whatever they may have got in their private Colleges, in classics, divinity, &c. is not brought to bear in their *University examination*, and that all from which *the University* judges—all in which *it* examines (with the exception stated in the paragraph), all for which *it* awards honors, all of which *it* takes cognizance, and all *it* professes to reward with a degree, is mathematical science. Now, Sir, is not this fact? And if it is, why have you made me say that which I *pointedly* have not said? When the words thus printed in italics, in my pamphlet, are coupled with the context there, it appears impossible to misunderstand them without design. You appear to blame me for calculating each man's expenses of education at an average from 700*l.* to 800*l.* You call yourself a tutor and examiner, and though you have not printed your name in your title-page, yet you have, in the body of your pamphlet, sufficiently declared yourself, and given a description which nobody can mistake; you own yourself to have had long and great experience as a tutor and examiner. Now, Sir, let me ask you, on the faith of that experience, have I *over-rated* the expense? If I have, tell us how much, and you will rejoice the heart of many an anxious parent. But I think, Sir, in common candor, you ought to go somewhat farther, and tell us if I have *under-rated* the amount. Sir, will you honestly and fairly do this?

I have stated, Sir, that from twelve to fifteen individuals annually may be supposed to pursue their mathematical studies to a considerable extent after they have taken their degrees. I may have under-rated this, but certainly not intentionally, and I do not think I have. You are a tutor and examiner of long experience. Tell us honestly and fairly what is the result of it.

If this calculation is true, then the deduction from it, that all the benefit of this expense is concentrated in from twelve to fifteen individuals, is true also. Would it not be more satisfactory, Sir, to refute my statements by *proofs* than by sneers?

You proceed, Sir, to say, that "I am pleased to style the unhonored class, the *πολλοί*!" Surely, Sir, no fair critic would fasten upon this term to upbraid me with. Sir, I ask, if you, if any member of the University, from the Vice-Chancellor to the lowest under-graduate, does not understand the term,—if it is not familiar in the mouth of every one,—if there is any so usual designation of "the unhonored class," as you are pleased to phrase them,—any term by which they are so continually, I had almost said so invariably, spoken of? You *might* also have remarked, Sir, that, in speaking of this phrase, and some other expressions, in a note, I have said that, "by the use of these plain terms, I mean to convey no reproach."

Sir, do you think that this criticism of your's will be much attended to by men of candid minds? will it give them a high opinion of your own candor and sincerity? and if it does not, will the criticism do your own pamphlet any good?

You then recur to the charge with which you set out, namely that of my depreciating or misapprehending the value of mathematical studies, and being "incredibly ignorant" of the real pursuits of the place. Perhaps, Sir, I am an older member of the Senate than yourself. My residence in the University has not been short, and I have taken some interest in its "real pursuits;" so that although I grant no man better qualified to speak of them than an experienced tutor and examiner, "who has had long and intimate acquaintance with them;" yet still I cannot be so incredibly ignorant about the matter as you imagine.

It is true, I cannot reply to this part of your observations, because they do not at all concern my pamphlet. You have set up a man of straw, to knock down for your own amusement. I have used no such arguments as you are pleased to put into my hands. Indeed, I must say, you have not treated me much better than Commodus did his unfortunate victims, whom he used to dress up as monsters, and furnish with sponges to throw at him instead of stones. I have never said, that "such a thing as education did not exist *in the respective Colleges.*" My whole argument turns on the *University examination* for degrees being in *mathematics exclusively*. I have printed this in italics, as I said before, to guard against misapprehension; and with a farther view to the same end, I have said, "except the short examination of one day, in Locke, Paley, and Butler, in the Senate House, the *University* must be supposed to know nothing of their progress in these things." I have printed the word *University* in italics; I have said, their short examination *in the Senate House,* which last words I added, to prevent the possibility of mistake; and instead of noticing this, you affect to infer, that I "am totally ignorant that there exists such a thing as education in the respective Colleges," (as if I knew nothing of *College Lectures,*) and "that I have not the slightest suspicion" of the effect of mathematics upon the reasoning powers, when I have, in the passage already quoted, stated those effects, if not in the same words, perhaps, at least, as unequivocally, and to the same purport, as you have yourself.

You then, *without quoting the context,* select, as a specimen of my pamphlet, a passage which you think suited to your purpose. Now, Sir, in common fairness, should you not have quoted the four preceding paragraphs; should you not, *if you merely wished to show the intentions* of the writer whom you are attempting to refute, have quoted the following passages, immediately preceding your extract?

"Of these individuals I cannot be supposed to speak or think disrespectfully, when I ask, Of what *use* to them are their mathematics, without the walls of the University, in common life?

"*How many* Cambridge mathematicians distinguish themselves *by bringing their mathematics to bear* upon the useful arts?

"Is it true, that they, generally speaking, turn their mathematics to any account, except that of speculative amusement, or academic contention?

"They may be, and no doubt they often are, very ingenious and acute men, but does that ingenuity and acuteness, for the most part, *tell,* to any great moral, or political, or social purpose?

"Are not, in fact, the greater number of calculations and combinations by which mathematics are brought to bear upon the arts, made by men who have not received an academic education?"

Can any thing be more unjust, than first to attribute to the person you think proper to oppose, arguments he *has never* used, and deduce inferences he has pointedly guarded against, and then to give the conclusion of arguments he *has* used, without stating his premises? Sir, I pass by your contemptuous sneer, after the extract you have made; I will only answer gravely and truly, that *I am really* a graduate of the University, and one, too, who is not used to be treated contumeliously by any of its members, and who, perhaps, may be honored with as much respect and attention, by many of them, even as one "who has spent many years in the University, in the constant occupation of a tutor and an examiner."

You say, Sir, that the tendency of my arguments is to show that mathematics ought no longer to be encouraged as a branch of our University studies. Such, Sir, is not the tendency of my arguments; they go to show, what you, yourself, almost in the same words, wish to prove, that it is not reasonable that the honors, and, generally speaking, the rewards of the University, should be confined to mathematics alone; but that this *exclusive* preference should be laid aside. And when I still grant mathematics the *precedence*, in the course of academical honors, I do precisely what you advise yourself, and I do it, as I suppose you do, in the spirit of conciliation towards the advocates of those studies, and with a desire to make no *innovation* for the mere sake of change, but to admit such *improvements* as justice, the interests of the University, and the promotion of general literature, seem to require.

You then find fault with the scheme I propose, which, however, I find very much the same with one also mentioned with disapprobation in your pamphlet. But how different, Sir, is your language. There is, in fact, very little difference in the *substance* of the schemes. Each proposes to make the examination principally in divinity; each proposes to concede no honors, and to grant no exemption, but to make it imperative on all; there may be some difference in minor points, but the difference in *fact* is very inconsiderable, and this coincidence between two persons who had no communication with each other, only tends to show the propriety and reasonableness of this scheme. Yet how different is the treatment which these similar plans experience from you! The one, is sanctioned by a known and distinguished character in the University, the other, by an unknown individual; that of the unknown is sneered at with the most petulant contempt; that sanctioned by the known authority, is, indeed, dissented from, but in the most temperate and respectful terms. This is precisely the course which would be adopted by one who was inclined to fawn with servility on his superiors, and to be proportionably insolent where he thought he might be so with impunity.

You make yourself very merry with my use of the word examinant, to signify a young man under examination. I have already said what I think necessary on this head. The word appeared to me perfectly intelligible in the use I made of it; that it was so, is proved by your condescending rightly to interpret it, and in a pamphlet of the kind I was writing, the first word which occurred, seemed quite sufficient; my business was not with *words*, but *things*.

You are next pleased to attack my scheme of honors, omitting, according to your usual practice, every explanatory and qualifying sentence. In my scheme of examination, for instance, you omit, "I do not pretend to dictate to the good sense of the University, but as a member of it, I may be allowed, without presumption, to state, that I think the Greek Gospels, Grotius de Veritate, and the first volume of Bishop Tomline's Theology, are sufficient for the proposed examination." Now every candid reader will acknowledge that I arrogate nothing dictatorial here, but that I state my sentiments with all that deference and respect to the wisdom of the University, which *every* individual of such a body ought to show. This, however, you have suppressed, and the inference you leave your readers to draw, from that suppression, is naturally unfavorable. Again, speaking of my scheme of honors, you say, "At the degree time, he (Eubulus) means to have one tripos, or list of honors, in each department, which is, on no account, to exceed forty;" which you call a Procrustean rule.

Now, you either can understand what you read, or you cannot. If you can understand it, and state that to be fact, which you understand and know *not* to be fact, I must leave the public to give you the name you deserve; I will not utter it. If you cannot understand what you read, you have no business to set up for a critic on the subject, though I am well aware that even our reviewers do not always attend to this point so much as they ought. However, this *is* my scheme, as stated by me, p. 9.:

"So much for this subject. I am content merely to throw out hints on it, because I have little time for more, and trust these will be sufficient for future exertions. Will it be allowed me to state my own view of the improved system, in the most general terms, leaving the detail and modification of them to the sense of the University.

"I would oblige every man, at the expiration of his two first years, to undergo the above-mentioned preparatory examination; and he should then be called upon to declare whether he intended to graduate in mathematics, or classics, which should not preclude him from offering himself for examination in the senate-house in both. In the senate-house examination, the week for mathematics should proceed as usual. That for classics should follow, in which there should be a first, second, and third class, as in mathematics. Let the senior wrangler preserve his preeminence, and next to him the first of the first class classics; then the other wranglers, who, in most cases, should not exceed 15, and then the other first class classics, who should not exceed the like number. Next to these, mathematical senior optimés, not exceeding 14; and then second class classics, the same number.

Then the mathematical junior optimes, and the third class classics, whose number should not exceed ten respectively. This would give, supposing each class full, 40 mathematical, and as many classical honors; but it is to be presumed that several men would be ranked in both classes. If the fellowships of the University are distributed with due regard to these honors, no doubt a greater emulation will be excited to excel in both departments."

Now, first, you ought in fairness to have stated my preliminary sentence, which declares, that the scheme is only thrown out for consideration. Secondly, you have suppressed the words, "then the other wranglers, *who in most cases should not exceed fifteen*," which, coupled with the words at the conclusion of the scheme, "*this would give, supposing each class full, forty mathematical, and as many classical honours*," evidently prove that I never meant, in every case, to limit the number of honors to forty in each class. Thirdly, you have made me say, that the list of honors is *on no account* to exceed forty in each department, which is what I *never have said*, and which I have shown by the express limitation of my words, when speaking of the number of wranglers, *that I never meant*. Fourthly, you call this a Procrustean list. Now, as far as I remember to have read about Procrustes, he was a gentleman who amused himself with making every body he could lay his hands on, fit the measure of his own bed. That is, if his victim was too short, he stretched him longer; if too long, he cut him shorter. I have already shown, by the use of the words *in most cases*, and by the general context, that I did not mean to *limit* the length to a fixed standard, and abridge the number of honors, where more were required, and by the words *supposing each class full*, it is evident I did not mean to *extend* the number of honors beyond the number of candidates really deserving of them. It therefore is clear, that what you call a Procrustean rule, can in neither case be applied to Procrustean practice. The fact is, that I pitched upon that number of honors which I thought most proportionate to the probable number of candidates, and exemplified, by a particular instance, what might perhaps be applicable not unfrequently, but what I expressly stated was *not to be taken as a rule of invariable application*. It seemed expedient to fix a limit somewhere, by way of illustration, and this I did, after having said, that *I left the detail and modification of the whole to the sense of the University*; and, "*that I was contented to throw out hints*," for others to act on.

Philograntus, are you a fair, honest, liberal opponent, and being such, will you justify what you have here stated?

You proceed to make yourself merry at my calling the mathematical questions *puzzling*, and quite chuckle at the perplexity they must have occasioned me at my examination. Perhaps, you imagine, I was *plucked*, if I may use a well-known expression, and that I write "vehemently," as you call it, against mathematics, to gratify my old spleen against them, and revenge my former disgrace. *Hæret lateri lethalis arundo.* Sir, I was not plucked. Sir, I will not tell you *now* whether I had a place in the Tripos or not, but I do not say that I will *never* tell you.

You blame me for saying, "that the labors of Newton are neglected;" but with your usual fairness, you omit the context and explanation of those words; and you do not add what immediately follows in my pamphlet, "*that they no longer occupy that proud and pre-eminent station which is due to their intrinsic merit, and to his immortal name, to national honor and academic veneration.*" Now, Sir, would it not have been candid to have added this? Does not this explain what I mean, by saying that "the labors of Newton are neglected," and do not you allow "that too much stress has been sometimes laid upon French analytics;" and, "that my complaint, however overstated, may have some sort of foundation?" Once more, are you a fair, honest, and impartial critic? If you are, make it appear so by a course of proceeding very different from that which you have adopted towards me.

You then proceed to state, "that I reflect without the shadow of justification on the academic system, when I say that too much stress is laid on the Greek dramatic writers, to the exclusion of the rest." But, Sir, you do not observe, that I am speaking not merely of the classical *examinations* here, but of and to the *examiners* themselves. I introduce the subject by saying, that I suppose the intended classical examination "would, of course, comprise, not merely the construing Greek and Latin, but a variety of questions connected with the passages selected, and depending on history, antiquities, chronology, geography, metrical and philological criticism, and ancient philosophy." Then I continue, "*and this leads me to a remark, which will be, perhaps, unpalatable* TO SOME OF OUR DISTINGUISHED SCHOLARS, but which truth compels me not to omit: I mean, that our range of Greek reading is at present too much confined."

Now, Sir, I am sure I am justified in saying this, but I am not sure that you, *from consciousness of the truth of my assertion,* have not endeavoured to apply my expressions to a different subject, ingeniously enough, but not very fairly. Sir, I put it to yourself: I dare say, you are a syndic of the University press; very likely you are an editor. From the year 1800 to the present time, has any thing issued from that press, in Greek literature, *but* Greek Plays? We have had Porson's Euripides, Butler's Æschylus, Blomfield's Æschylus, and Monk's Euripides; but has one treatise, one line of Plato, Aristotle, Xenophon, Thucydides, Polybius, or Demosthenes, been published? We have been inundated with Greek plays, but we have had no Greek orators, no Greek historians, no Greek philosophers. Disprove this, if you can, and then say that my remarks have not "the pretence or shadow of justification." You sneer, Sir, at my supposed ignorance of monostrophics, as you before did at my supposed ignorance of mathematics. Sir, do not take too much for granted. Whether I know much or little on that subject, I will not tell you *now*, but I am amused with your conjectures as to my ignorance, and think I can trace, from some of your expressions in the present instance, the origin of your hostility. You evidently suppose me connected with the Edinburgh Review; I smile at your conjecture, and I leave you to make the most you can of an avowed false quantity in my title-page, by way of confirming it.

You, perhaps, think you have a fine opportunity of vanquishing a critical opponent, and by the eagerness with which you have lugged in Mr. Brougham and the Edin. Rev., both into the body of your pamphlet, and the appendix, you perhaps would wish to be esteemed the author of a certain article on Mr. Brougham's Education System, which appeared in the Quarterly Review, and which, if it *was* wholly written by you, is, I think, the best thing you ever wrote.

Without some motive of this kind, I can hardly account for the violence and wantonness of your attack; unless you *really* believed Eubulus to be some tame and contemptible scribbler, whom you might put down as easily as an unfortunate freshman who has missed your lectures; in the one case, I pity your want of tact, in the other your want of generosity. Before I take my leave of you, I must observe, that if I had been attacked by a direct antagonist of the plan we both wish, in the main, to see carried into effect, I should probably not have replied; but in the present case, when I am aggrieved by one of my own party, I feel it necessary to vindicate myself by an explanation of my meaning in some instances, a disavowal of the construction put upon my words in others, and an exposure of the unfair misrepresentation of them in still more. My whole pamphlet was written in temperate and respectful language, with feelings of great goodwill to all parties, with honest intentions and earnest zeal for the welfare of the University, and the best interests of those who are educated in it. What can be your motives for attacking it, unless those I have assigned, I cannot guess. You well know how much mankind love to be saved the trouble of thinking for themselves, and cannot doubt but that those who have not yet read my pamphlet, will be content to take your descriptio of it, without forming an opinion for themselves. It is with a vie of counteracting the effect of your remarks, that I have written th foregoing pages, in which I have confined myself strictly to the defensive, without attempting to retaliate, by criticising your pamphlet in return. Men are apt to think favorably enough of themselves, and you may, perhaps, imagine that you are invulnerable in that part, where I have not inflicted a wound. You may think so, if you like, for the opinion is harmless, and is to me a matter of the most perfect indifference. I have already declared the reasons for my conduct in this respect, and whether they satisfy *you* or not, it is enough, and perhaps quite as well for you, that they satisfy me,

March 4, 1822.

A CHARGE,

DELIVERED

BY

THE RIGHT REV. DR. JOHN KAYE,

LORD BISHOP OF BRISTOL,

AT HIS

PRIMARY VISITATION OF THAT DIOCESE,

IN AUGUST, 1821.

LONDON:

1822.

A CHARGE,

&c. &c.

I AM convinced, my reverend brethren, that, when you engaged in the work of the ministry, you engaged in it with a just sense of the weighty obligations which it would impose on you. You felt that you were enrolling yourselves under the banners, not of a triumphant, but of a militant church; of a church, which is exposed to continual danger from the attacks of watchful and indefatigable enemies; and which cannot, therefore, allow even a momentary relaxation of vigilance and zeal on the part of its defenders. Persuaded that the office, to which you were called, was one, not of inactivity and ease, but of unremitting exertion and anxiety, you determined thenceforward to devote every energy of body and of mind to the faithful discharge of your professional duties.

Such, I am convinced, were the feelings and resolutions by which you were animated when you entered upon the work of the ministry; feelings and resolutions, which your subsequent experience must have tended to confirm and strengthen. If I thus advert to them, it is not because I suspect your bosoms to be strangers to their influence; but because I think that, if there were ever a time when the circumstances of the church peculiarly required that such principles should actuate the conduct of its ministers, that time is the present. I am not insensible to the existence of a disposition in the minds of men to exaggerate the magnitude of the transactions in which they are themselves engaged, and to imagine that no age of the world has produced events of equal moment and interest with those which it has been their lot to witness. Yet after we have made every possible allowance for the effect which this disposition may have in biassing our judgments, we shall still be justified in affirming that the state of the visible church of Christ, and especially of that part of it to which we belong, is such as to excite the deepest anxiety and apprehension in all, who duly appreciate the importance of religion, as well to the temporal, as to the eternal interests of mankind. Permit me then on this occasion, when for the first time I address you as your Diocesan, to offer a few suggestions upon certain points connected with the discharge of your ministerial functions, which appear to me more particularly to deserve your attention.

The subject to which I shall in the first instance allude is one, that concerns not only the members of our own church, but all who profess to believe in the divine origin of the gospel; I mean the wide dissemination of infidel opinions in the present day. Infidelity, it is true, is not an evil of modern growth; but it has of late assumed a very different form from that under which it long displayed itself to the world. Formerly its disciples were to be found only amongst the higher ranks of society; either amongst the rich and powerful, who, dissatisfied with the uncompromising purity of the gospel precepts, were disposed in consequence to deny their divine authority; or amongst the disputers of this world, who, desirous of acquiring a reputation for superior talent and sagacity, thought that they could not better attain their object than by calling in question truths, in which the great majority of mankind had long acquiesced with undoubting confidence; and who received at length the appropriate punishment of their presumption, being themselves entangled in the web of their own sophistry. But now the baneful influence of scepticism is no longer confined within the same narrow limits; it extends to all classes of the community; men in the obscurest walks of life have caught the contagion, and have learned to think and to speak of the gospel as a mere imposture, as a scheme devised by crafty men for the purpose of holding their fellow-creatures in a state of subjection.

Although the intrinsic criminality of infidel opinions must remain the same, whatever be the rank or station of those by whom they are professed, yet when viewed with reference to their effects upon civil society, the lower the condition of the persons among whom they prevail, the more formidable are the dangers which may be justly apprehended from their operation. The possessor of wealth and greatness may find it convenient to persuade himself that a religion is false, which forbids the indulgence of many of his favorite propensities; but he wishes to retain the worldly splendor and enjoyments by which he is surrounded, and is sensible of the powerful tendency of Christianity to render men peaceable and contented with their condition. While, therefore, he himself rejects the authority of the gospel, he is desirous that it should retain its influence over the minds of others. But men in the inferior ranks of life have not the same motives to induce them to desire the permanence of the existing fabric of society; they are disposed rather to imagine that every change must turn to their advantage, and if they once cast off the restraints of religion, will be easily persuaded to engage in any undertaking by which a change may be accomplished.

With respect to the precise degree in which infidelity has been diffused amongst the lower classes of the community, I am aware that there exists a considerable difference of opinion. Yet that man must, I think, be strangely blinded by prejudice, who can in the present day deny that it prevails to an alarming extent. To the Christian minister, who feels that it is peculiarly his duty to watch over the spiritual interests of his poorer and less instructed brethren, this must be a subject of frequent and painful meditation; and his thoughts will be anxiously directed to the consideration of the most effectual means, as well of bringing back those members of his flock who may have been led astray by the specious arguments of the infidel, as of firmly establishing the faith of those who have hitherto been preserved from the contagion. Could these desirable objects be attained by the force of reasoning alone, the task of the advocate of the gospel would be comparatively easy. So long as the labors of the great luminaries of our church remain, he can never be at a loss for weapons with which to repel the most formidable attacks of the adversary. In their writings he will find a probable solution of every doubt and a satisfactory answer to every cavil which sceptical ingenuity has yet been able to urge. But if I may without presumption hazard a remark on this subject in the presence of men, whose long experience in the work of the ministry must render them much better qualified than myself to decide upon the most effectual mode of influencing the minds of their hearers, it is my persuasion that disquisitions on the evidences of Christianity, however ingenious and profound, when addressed to persons in the lower stations of life, will seldom answer the end proposed. Such persons are for the most part unaccustomed to close and accurate reasoning, and are consequently incapable of following us in our argument and of perceiving the connexion between our premises and our conclusions. Our appeals must be addressed to the heart rather than the head. We must dwell upon the peculiar doctrines of the gospel, upon those doctrines which, proceeding as they did from him who [1] "knew what was in man," cannot but be best calculated to command the assent, and to influence the practice of man. Speak to your congregations of the general corruption of human nature and of their own particular transgressions, topics on which their own consciences will bear testimony to the truth of your representations; bid them review their past lives and see how infinitely short their practice has fallen even of their own imperfect notions of duty; having thus brought them to a just sense of the need in which the whole human race must stand both of pardon for their sins and of support for their weakness, proceed to convince them how impossible it is for man by his own unassisted efforts to procure that pardon and support; then turn to the sacred volume, and show them that all their wants are abundantly supplied in the gracious provisions which God has been pleased to make for the redemption and sanctification of his fallen creatures. It is not by dwelling in our discourses on the nature of the evidence which is necessary to establish the truth of a divine revelation, that we can hope effectually to secure our less educated brethren against the insidious attacks of infidelity; but by making them feel the exquisite adaptation of the promises and precepts of the gospel to the actual condition of man, and thus affording them as it were an experimental proof that it proceeded from the same Almighty Being who called man into existence and best knows what his condition requires.

The point, to which I wish in the second place to call your attention, regards the relation in which you stand to those who dissent from the established church. In this country the state concedes to christians of every denomination perfect liberty to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience. Let it not for a moment be supposed that I entertain the most remote design of questioning the wisdom of this concession.—Independently of all considerations of natural justice, I am convinced that a liberal toleration of religious opinions affords the best security to a national establishment. Yet it must, I think, be admitted that the full toleration enjoyed by dissenters in these kingdoms has given birth to very erroneous notions respecting the nature of the sin of schism. Men are too much in the habit of overlooking the distinction between legal and moral guilt, and of imagining that every act which the law permits may be performed with a safe conscience. They see that the state attaches no penalty to a secession from the established church, and they persuade themselves that, where there is no legal penalty, there can be no violation of duty. Thus by degrees it has come to pass that, by a large portion of the community, the Church of England is regarded as standing upon precisely the same ground as the numerous sects into which protestants are divided; and every pretext, however trivial, is deemed sufficient to justify a separation from it.

---

[1] John 2—25.

Great circumspection, therefore, is required on the part of the established clergy in the present day, least they should, either by their actions or by their language, appear to countenance these erroneous opinions, and thus add strength to the too prevalent persuasion that it is a matter of comparative indifference whether a man, who has been bred in the church of England, shall adhere or not adhere to its communion. I mean not to censure those who aspire to the praise of candor and liberality; but I think that a reputation for these qualities ought not to be sought at the risk of weakening the interests of that church, which we have solemnly bound ourselves to support with our most strenuous exertions. In viewing the relative situations of the established church and of the various Protestant Sects in this kingdom, we must never lose sight of this important fact, that our dissenting brethren separated from us. This fact affords a vantage-ground which we must never abandon; since so long as we retain it, we throw upon our adversary the task of proving that his separation was an act of absolute necessity. Until he can substantiate this point, he remains justly chargeable with the sin of schism. It is in vain that he has recourse to the plea which is not unfrequently urged in justification of dissent, that men in the present day have the same right to secede from the Church of England which our forefathers had to break off their connexion with the See of Rome. The founders of our church knew that it was incumbent on them to establish, not merely the reasonableness, but the necessity of their separation; to show that the only alternative left them was either to quit the church of Rome, or to acquiesce in the perpetuation of those erroneous doctrines by which its teachers had sullied the purity and impaired the integrity of the Christian faith. This task they undertook and successfully accomplished. Before, therefore, our dissenting brethren try to shelter themselves under the example of our venerable reformers, they ought to copy it in all its parts, and begin by proving that the necessity of a secession was in their own case equally imperious. Without wishing to call in question the right of private judgment, it is our duty frequently to remind our hearers that they are morally accountable for the exercise of that right; and that it is not every difference of opinion which will justify a separation from the established church, but a conscientious difference upon points that regard the essentials of religion, and involve fundamental articles, either of faith or practice.

But it is not only by the desire of obtaining a reputation for candour and liberality that we are liable to be betrayed into conduct, that may appear to countenance the erroneous notions respecting schism on which I have now been animadverting. There exists in the minds of many men a persuasion that the advancement of the Church of Christ, as contra-distinguished to the Church of England or any other part of the visible church, should be the great aim of the sincere believer. One effect of this persuasion upon the opinions of those by whom it is adopted is, that agreement in public worship constitutes in their estimation a feeble principle of connexion, in comparison with that complete identity of hearts and affections by which the members of the Mystical Church of Christ are bound together. Where that identity is conceived to exist, all difference with respect to outward religious profession, to points that relate only to the administration of the visible church, is easily overlooked. The persons who are under the influence of the persuasion just described forget, that there are no *certain* marks by which the members of the Mystical Church of Christ can be distinguished during their residence on earth. They forget too that the very constitution of man's nature requires that he should unite himself to some visible church. It is only by such an union that he can obtain the benefits of social worship, or avail himself of *all* the means which God has appointed for the communication of his grace.—With reference, therefore, to differences of religious profession the minister of the establishment will see, that his surest mode of advancing the interests of the Church of Christ is zealously to enforce the obligation, under which all men are placed, of surrendering their own opinions in matters that cannot be conscientiously deemed of essential moment, and of thus hastening, as far as in them lies, the approach of that time, when the promise of our blessed Lord shall be accomplished, and there shall be, both in appearance and in reality, [1] "one fold and one shepherd."

In the suggestions which I have thought it my duty to offer on this subject, there will, I trust, be found nothing in the slightest degree at variance with that spirit of Christian charity, which ought to influence our whole behaviour towards those who differ from us in a matter so deeply interesting as religion. The circumspection, which I recommend to you, implies no want of respect or kindness for the persons of our dissenting brethren, no blind or illiberal prejudice against their opinions, no unreasonable jealousy of their designs. It implies only a predilection for the Church of England; a predilection founded upon a careful and dispassionate comparison of its rites and doctrines with those of other churches. So far am I from regarding the want of this predilection as a subject on which a clergyman of the Church of England is justified in priding himself, that I am at a loss to understand how a man, who does not entertain such a preference, can conscientiously solicit admission into the ministry.

---

[1] John 10—16.

One necessary consequence of this well-grounded predilection for the national church will be a punctual conformity to its ritual, a studious adherence to the forms which it prescribes in the celebration of the offices of religion. On this subject I deem it necessary to offer a few remarks, because there exists in the present day too great a tendency to depreciate all external forms, and to represent a strict adherence to them as wholly unimportant. True it is, that the ceremonies of religion derive all their efficacy from the spiritual temper with which they are performed; if that be wanting, the mere observance of an established rite must be altogether unavailing. But that man must possess a very imperfect acquaintance with human nature, who conceives that a religious society, comprehending within it numerous individuals, can long subsist without the aid of external forms: and that man must possess a no less imperfect acquaintance with the limits of moral duty, who, having once entered into the ministry, thinks that he is at liberty either to omit or to alter at his own pleasure the forms enjoined by the religious society to which he belongs. To suppose that outward ceremonies contribute little towards the maintenance and diffusion of spiritual religion in the world is to suppose, that the constitution of man's nature has undergone a total change; that he is become altogether independent of his senses; and that his mind is no longer influenced by association and by sympathy. To suppose that every minister, in the celebration of the offices of religion, is not bound strictly to comply with the prescribed ritual, is to suppose, that it is allowable for individuals to follow their own opinions in opposition to the authority which they are pledged to obey; a supposition so monstrous that it would not be endured for a moment in a question relating to the interests of civil society. But so it is; when religion is concerned, men reason and act upon principles of which, in any other case, they would be themselves the first to discover and expose the pernicious tendency. They are induced to deviate from an established form by the hope of securing some immediate advantage to the cause of religion; forgetting that no particular advantage can possibly compensate the mischief arising from the transgression of those general laws by the observance of which society is held together: forgetting too that, if every individual were to assume to himself the same liberty, all uniformity of ceremonies must soon be done away, and with it the benefits of social worship be entirely lost.

Far then from regarding an adherence to established forms as a matter of trivial importance, the minister of the church of England will perceive that it is closely connected with the promotion of spiritual religion; and will not only abstain from making any unauthorised innovations, but will be careful that nothing be wanting on his part to give to the public offices of the church their full weight and efficacy. Had the importance of this scrupulous attention to the prescribed ritual been at all times duly appreciated, I am inclined to think that the low and unworthy notions at present too prevalent respecting the rite of baptism would never have obtained so wide a circulation. So long as baptism was celebrated in the mode and at the time appointed by the liturgy, in a place set apart to the worship of God, and in the face of a congregation assembled together to offer to him their prayers and thanksgivings, every circumstance contributed to impress the mind with a deep sense of the exalted and solemn character of the rite, and men felt a ready disposition to believe that the divine blessing would attend a ceremony administered with every external mark of seriousness and devotion. But when, through the false pride or indolence of Parents on the one hand, and the too easy compliance of the Ministers of the establishment on the other, the practice of baptising children in private houses began generally to prevail; when the rite was no longer celebrated in the temple of God, where every object is associated with devout feelings, but in the rooms of a private mansion, the place of our constant abode, and consequently connected in our minds with the cares, the interests and the follies of the world,—not in the presence of a large assembly met together for the purposes of social worship, but of a few persons, less intent perhaps upon the ceremony itself than upon the festive merriment by which it was to be succeeded,—when so complete a departure from the views of the framers of our liturgy had taken place, can we wonder that the rite ceased to be regarded with the same veneration, and that men began to doubt whether it were in truth the sign of an inward and spiritual Grace? The careless and negligent administration of baptism, which may in no small degree be traced to the practice of performing the rite in private houses, has, I am convinced, made more converts to the opinion, that regeneration does not take place in baptism, than all the arguments which learned and ingenious men have been able to produce in its support.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is still regarded by the great body of the Members of our Church with that reverence, which is due to an ordinance, instituted by our Blessed Redeemer himself as one of the appointed means of communicating his grace to man. The very excuses which men are accustomed to make for absenting themselves from the holy communion, weak and unsatisfactory as they must appear to the eye of reason, clearly prove the importance which those who urge them attach to a participation in that sacred rite. Although they are unwilling to adopt that course of life which will fit them to approach the altar of the Lord, yet by their conduct they manifest their conviction that to approach it is a solemn act, requiring a previous and diligent preparation of the heart. Great then will be our responsibility if, through any carelessness or remissness on our part, or through any desire of substituting our own fancies in the place of the forms which have been prescribed by the authority of the church, we impair the dignified solemnity which attends this holy mystery, or weaken those feelings of awe and veneration, with which it continues to be regarded. If on the one hand it is our duty to guard our hearers from the error of supposing, that the ceremonies of religion possess in themselves any intrinsic force and efficacy; so is it no less our duty on the other to take care, that we do not by a careless administration of its outward forms lead men to believe that we lightly esteem the spiritual benefits, with which by the ordinance of God himself those forms are connected.

I proceed to another topic, the most important perhaps to which your attention can be directed, but at the same time the topic on which the greatest variety of opinions is likely to prevail; I allude to the limits, which the Minister of the Church of England ought to prescribe to himself in his intercourse with the world. In the determination of this question the different habits, dispositions, and tempers of men will necessarily have great influence. Some are of a cheerful, social turn; others of a more retired and austere character; and what appears to the former only an innocent acquiescence in the customs of society, will be deemed by the latter a mark of a light and frivolous mind, and wholly unsuitable to that grave and dignified demeanour which the minister of the gospel ought on all occasions to maintain.

The first suggestion then which I shall venture to offer on this subject is, that we be careful not to put a harsh construction on the conduct of our brother, nor to fancy that, because his religion does not wear precisely the same appearance as our own, he is not therefore impressed with a due sense of the paramount importance of religion, and of the awful responsibility which attaches to the discharge of the ministerial functions. To prescribe a general standard of manners and demeanor, the slightest deviation from which shall be regarded as a proof of deficiency in religious feeling, is not more reasonable than to require that all men shall frame their countenances precisely according to the same model. Religion is not of this exclusive character; it will combine itself with all tempers and dispositions; with the lively, as well as the sedate; with the cheerful as well as the grave.

I shall observe in the second place that, in determining to what extent it is lawful for the christian minister to mix in the business or in the pleasures of the world, the error against which he should be most careful to guard is that of excess. When we were admitted into the Priesthood, we bound ourselves, if not by an express, yet by an implied promise, [1] "to give ourselves wholly to that office whereunto it had pleased God to call us, so that, as much as lay in us, we would apply ourselves wholly to that one thing and draw all our cares and studies that way." The mode in which we discharge the obligation thus contracted is the criterion, by which men of all classes, but especially those in the inferior ranks of life, estimate our sincerity. If at the very time that we are in our discourses enlarging upon the infinite superiority of heavenly to earthly interests, and inculcating the necessity of constant and earnest endeavours to abstract the thoughts from the present scene and to fix them upon eternity—if at this very time we show in our conduct a restless anxiety for worldly riches and distinction, or an immoderate eagerness in the pursuit of worldly pleasures, can we be surprised that our hearers, observing how much our behaviour is at variance with our exhortations, begin to suspect that we are not ourselves in reality persuaded of the truth of doctrines, to which we allow so slight an influence over our practice?

It must indeed be admitted that the world is not unfrequently most unreasonable in its expectations; it requires from the clergy sacrifices of their worldly interests wholly incompatible with the obligation under which they, no less than the rest of the community, are placed of making a suitable provision for their families; it requires from them such an entire dedication both of their mental and bodily powers to the duties of their profession, as would allow them no opportunities of relaxation and preclude them from every amusement, however innocent and blameless in its nature. Is it incumbent upon them to comply with these extravagant expectations? By no means. In our concessions to the feelings and opinions of the world we must not exceed certain limits, nor allow them to interfere with any positive duty which we owe either to ourselves or others. It can scarcely be necessary for me to remark that the suggestions, which I am now offering, have reference solely to that class of actions which are by moralists termed indifferent.

Actions, however, which considered in themselves are indifferent, may assume a character of positive good or evil, when viewed in connexion with the effects produced by them on the minds of others. Whether I shall enforce a particular right, or engage in certain amusements and pursuits, may, as far as regards the nature

[1] Service for Ordering Priests.

of the acts themselves, be a matter of indifference. But it ceases to be so, if the world has attached to the enforcement of that right a notion of harshness and oppression, or has connected with those amusements and pursuits an idea of levity and dissipation. The influence, which religion possesses among the members of any community, must in a great measure depend upon the respect and affection with which they regard its teachers. The christian minister will pause, therefore, before he does any act which can have even a remote tendency to excite feelings of an opposite description; or which, by inducing men to doubt the sincerity of his belief in the doctrines which he teaches, may indispose them to the cordial reception of the doctrines themselves. Knowing that it is his first duty to win all men to the cause of righteousness, he will not be too nice in weighing the reasonableness of the sacrifices either of interest or inclination which they require from him, but will be ready to condescend to their infirmities and prejudices. In perusing the writings of the New Testament no circumstance appears to me more clearly to evince the divine inspiration of the authors, than their intimate acquaintance with human nature, and the admirable adaptation of the rules, which they lay down for the conduct of life, to the various relations in which man is placed with respect to his fellow creatures. Were I required to produce an instance in confirmation of this remark, I would refer to the caution, delivered by St. Paul to the Roman converts for their guidance upon certain points which the gospel had left indifferent, [1] "Let not your good be evil spoken of."

I have now touched upon all the topics which appear to me particularly to demand your attention. I cannot, however, conclude my present address without reminding you, that the object of these stated meetings between the clergy and their Diocesan is to afford him an opportunity, not merely of offering them such advice as the circumstances of the Church may seem to him to require, but also of receiving from them such information as may enable him more effectually to administer the important office with which he is invested. If then there be any suggestions which may tend in your opinions to promote either the interests of religion, or your own individual comfort, (which, as far as my sense of duty will allow me, I shall ever be most anxious to consult), let me beg you, my reverend brethren, to communicate them frankly and without reserve, assuring yourselves that they will receive on my part an attentive and favorable consideration.

---

[1] Romans 14—16.

A
LETTER
TO THE
REV. W. L. BOWLES,
IN REPLY TO HIS LETTER TO
THOMAS CAMPBELL, ESQ.
AND TO HIS TWO LETTERS TO
THE RIGHT HON. LORD BYRON;
CONTAINING
A VINDICATION OF THEIR DEFENCE OF THE
POETICAL CHARACTER OF POPE,
AND
AN INQUIRY INTO THE NATURE OF POETICAL IMAGES, AND OF THE CHARACTERISTIC QUALITIES THAT DISTINGUISH POETRY FROM ALL OTHER SPECIES OF WRITING.

By M. M‘DERMOT.

The vulgar thus through imitation err,
As oft the learned by being singular;
So much they scorn the crowd, that if the throng
By chance go right, they purposely go wrong:
So schismatics the plain believers quit,
And are but damn'd for having too much wit.
POPE.

[*Concluded from No. XXXIX.*]

LONDON:
1822.

A

LETTER, &c.

How greatly then have you erred, when you transfer the whole of the poetry to the images or subject. I am aware, that you affect to assign a part of it to the execution. "Let me not, however," you say, "be considered as thinking that the subject alone constitutes poetical excellency. The execution is to be taken into consideration at the same time." Here you seem as usual, to have studied ambiguity of expression. The unwary reader might be led to suppose, that by the "execution" being taken into "consideration," you meant, that a part of the "poetical excellency" was to be ascribed to the execution. But you had no intention of conceding so much to the powers of the artist. Apprehending, however, that your readers would not be satisfied with a theory that ascribed no part of the "poetical excellency" to the execution, you thought to get over the difficulty, by using a form of expression, which would incline them to think you granted one half to the subject, and the other to the execution. You were, however, wise enough to know, that taking the subject into consideration was one thing, and admitting its claim to a share in constituting poetical excellency, was another; and accordingly, the consideration you came to was, to reject all claims of the kind; for immediately afterwards you add, "the subject and the execution are equally to be considered; the one respecting the poetry, the other, the art and powers of the poet. The poetical subject, and the arts and talent of the poet, should always be kept in mind; and, I imagine it is for want of observing this rule, that so much has been said, and so little understood, of the real ground of Pope's character as a poet." What a pity you did not perceive, that the rule by which you wish to direct us in judging of Pope's poetical character, is infinitely more difficult to be understood than what it attempts to explain. Who can possibly elicit any thing like meaning out of the passage which I have now quoted? "The subject and the execution," you say, "are equally to be considered; the one respecting the poetry; the other, the art and powers of the poet." So far we are told nothing; for it serves no purpose to know, that we are to take these things into consideration, without knowing for what end, or in what point of view we are to consider them. The remainder of the passage gives no explanation. "The poetical subject and the arts and talent of the poet should always be kept in mind." We are now just as wise as we were before. We may, indeed, keep these matters in mind as long as we please; but till we know why they are to be kept in mind, we gain but little by the tenacity of our memory. And yet, without another word on the subject, you tell us, it is for want of observing this rule, that so much has been said, and so little understood, of the real grounds of Pope's character as a poet. But where, in the name of common sense, is the "rule" that we should observe, and that is to guide us through this mysterious and poetical character? We are told in one place, to consider the subject and the execution; and in another, to keep them in mind; and here is the grand rule that is to give us a clue to the real ground of Pope's poetical character. You complain that you have been misunderstood by Mr. Campbell, that you have been misunderstood by the writer of the Critique on your *invariable principles* of poetry, in the Quarterly Review, that you have been misunderstood by Mr. Gilchrist, and finally that you have been misunderstood by Lord Byron. But can you seriously complain of being misunderstood, when you write what conveys no meaning? Where the meaning is enveloped in mystery, every reader is left to guess at it as well as he can, and if he should not happen "to hit the nail on the head," and guess exactly what you mean, who is in fault? You must therefore study perspicuity of expression, before you complain of being misunderstood. The best writers have been led to support erroneous principles; but then no person was at a loss to discover what these principles were; for an erroneous proposition contains nothing in itself that renders the expression of it obscure. If I maintain, that two and two make five, I maintain what is erroneous; but then my meaning is as clearly understood, as if I said that two and two make four. You would, therefore, be excusable, had you merely advocated false principles, for the greatest writers have done so before you; but I know not whether it be possible to excuse a writer, whose language is as unintelligible as his principles are erroneous.

I believe, however, we can get a clue to this mysterious passage from the sentence with which it commences, "Let me not, however, be considered as thinking that the subject alone constitutes poetical excellency." From this we are evidently to conclude, that something else must co-operate with the subject before it becomes poetical, and this something we imagine we discover, when you immediately add, "The execution is to be taken into consideration." Here we are inclined to think that the *execution* is that something which is to constitute a part of the poetical excellency, even though you do not inform us into what kind of consideration it is to be taken. And we are warranted in thinking so, for as you inform us that the subject alone does not constitute poetical excellency, and as there must therefore be something else to co-operate with it, and as there is no something else mentioned throughout the entire of your answer to Lord Byron but the execution, we are led by the most rigid and logical process of reasoning, to conclude, that the execution is that something which co-operates with the subject in constituting poetical excellency. But how much are we deceived in drawing this inference; for when you come to explain yourself, you coolly turn round and tell us, that the subject is "to be considered respecting the poetry," the execution respecting "the art and powers of the poet." Now though there is certainly no meaning in saying we must consider the subject respecting the poetry, &c. as a thousand considerations might come into our heads relative to them, which never entered into yours, and with which, consequently, it was not your intention to trouble us, yet we can easily perceive from the context, that you mean to say, the poetry is to be ascribed to the subject, and the execution to the art and powers of the poet. No person can doubt, for a moment, that this is your meaning, and I dare say you will not deny it yourself; but then, if the poetry be ascribed to the subject alone, does it not flatly contradict the inference which we were led to make from your first and second propositions, namely, that the subject alone does not constitute poetical excellency, and that the execution was to be taken into consideration? From these propositions, we were justified in concluding, that the execution was what made up that part of the "poetical excellency" which the "subject alone did not constitute;" but here we are told, that we must ascribe the "poetry" to the "subject," and the "execution to the art and powers of the poet." If so, then, the execution comes in for no part of that poetical excellency which we were told "the subject alone did not constitute;" and though it does not constitute it, yet the entire of the poetry is here ascribed to it; and the only consideration into which the execution is to be taken, appears to be, that we must ascribe it to the art and powers of the poet. Whatever is poetical, therefore, in the Paradise Lost, is to be ascribed to the subject, and not to Milton: it is the execution alone for which he can be allowed any credit. But who can avoid being sick of this confusion of "subject, execution, poetry, poetical excellency, and art and powers of the poet?" Who can avoid smiling, when you condescend to admit that you do not think "the subject alone constitutes poetical excellency," though you immediately afterwards ascribe the entire to it? Does it require a moment's reflection to perceive, that the entire of the poetical excellency of the Iliad, the Æneid, and the Paradise Lost, must be entirely attributed to their illustrious authors, and to that poetical genius with which they were endowed by nature? If you were to attempt an heroic poem on a subject similar to either of these, I doubt whether you would not soon perceive, that the "poetical excellency" would depend more on yourself than on your subject. In my opinion, it is verging on idiotism to ascribe any part of the excellency of a poem to the subject; for if such a poem as the Iliad had been attempted by Pascal, Locke, Longuerie, or Bayle, they would have produced Iliads, which, so far from possessing any "poetical excellency," would be looked upon by the critics either as a stiff and affected kind of prose, or, at best, as a wretched species of prosaic versification. You must acknowledge, however, that if the powers of a Locke, a Newton, or of the most learned and profound writers, cannot render such a subject as the Iliad poetical, the poetical excellency must be in the execution alone, and not in the subject; for if any subject were poetical, none could be more so than that of the Iliad, judging of a poetical subject according to your own theory. It is therefore to the poetical mind, and not to the subject, that we must refer the entire of the poetical excellency. He who said,

Poeta nascitur, non fit,

was a much better judge of the nature of poetry than you appear to be; for he who is not born a poet, or whose genius is averse to it, will never attain to poetical excellency, whatever be the subject he treats, or however studious he may be of drawing all his images from nature alone.

It is not the subject therefore, or the images introduced by the poet, that constitute poetical excellency, or even the smallest ingredient in it. All depends, as I have already observed, on the associations created by the poet, that is, on the art with which he connects his images, and the ideas that naturally arise from the nature of this connexion. When Gray represents the eagle

Sailing with supreme dominion
Through the azure deep of air;

would you think it more poetical to say, flying with supreme dominion, than sailing? If your theory be of any value, the term "flying" would certainly be more poetical than that of "sailing," as it expresses the *natural* action of a natural being, and, consequently, this natural manner of moving through the air, and the term which expresses it, ought to be more poetical, because it is a natural image, than the image conveyed by sailing, which is a term taken from art. If, then, you acknowledge that "sailing" is more poetical than "flying with supreme dominion," what becomes of your "invariable principles?" Is not this an exception to them? and have we not here an image taken from art more poetical than an image taken from nature? How then is the poet to determine, according to you, when two images present themselves to him, one from nature, and the other from art? Is he *invariably* to prefer the image from nature? if so, we should correct these two lines of Gray, by reading flying for sailing. But if there be cases in which the image from art ought to be preferred, your poetical principles are consequently not invariable. You should therefore favor us with one other principle to direct us, when the natural image ought to be rejected, and the image from art preferred. Such a principle must be unavoidably added to those which you have already laid down, before the poet can properly avail himself of your "invariable principles;" for though this new principle will unfortunately prove the old ones not to be invariable; yet, without its presiding influence, we can never know when the image from art ought to be preferred to the image from nature; and we must in all cases follow the invariable principle that prefers the latter.

I am of opinion, that if any principle can be discovered which could enable us to use your invariable principles with proper caution, it would be, never to use images taken from art where the natural image can be admitted with propriety. Do you think your invariable principles sufficiently guarded by this restriction? If not, I doubt whether you can discover a better yourself, and I suspect, you would have originally placed it among your "principles," if you had thought of it, or imagined they would be so vulnerable without it. But I fear, your invariable principles cannot stand, even supported by this saving prop. Can any person suppose, that flying is not as properly, that it is not even more properly, applied to a bird than sailing? yet, though the application is proper, and though the image which it pictures to the mind is natural, we find that this natural image is infinitely less poetical than the image taken from art. The eagle "sailing with supreme dominion," has a majesty in it that cannot be perceived in the eagle flying. But what does this majesty arise from? Certainly, neither from art nor nature, using the term in your sense of it, but from association. There is a majesty in the motion of a ship in full sail, and we feel a peculiar pleasure in perceiving this majesty transferred to an object placed in a proud and elevated situation, where it is increased by its association with sublimity. We do not wait to examine with a cold and calculating hesitancy, whether a term more natural and appropriate to the eagle could be found, but yield at once to the elevated emotion produced by the united ideas of sublimity and majesty. The poet never stipulates with us to use no terms or epithets but what are rigidly and philosophically true. We know his object is to please rather than to instruct, but, if possible, to unite pleasure with instruction. When, therefore, he selects such epithets as are better fitted to elicit pleasing emotions, than to exercise our understandings, we yield without hesitation to their seductive influence, never regarding whether they were taken from nature or from art, and never inquiring by what magic they produce their effect. This truth is happily expressed by Mr. Campbell, in his Lectures on Poetry, where his subject leads him to treat of poetic fiction, and to distinguish it from delusive representations in prose:

"In poetry, and there alone, the illusion of language is not deception. When either the pleader misleads us into false sympathies, or the sophist into fanciful theories, there is no convention of the mind with their falsifications; nor would the wildest zealot of the most Utopian school of philosophy, so far compromise the dignity of his own understanding, as to acknowledge to himself that for the sake of pleasure, he was voluntarily embracing an error. But in poetry we are transported to enthusiasm, with what, as to literal occurrence, we know on the slightest reflection to be a dream. Nor does the retrospect of the judgment at all prevent us from rebuilding, with fresh delight, the airy edifice which has been thus disenchanted."

Having quoted from Mr. Campbell, I shall now examine the boast which you make relative to him, in your Reply to Lord Byron: "Mr. Campbell declined, at least, farther contest—whether because he would not, or because he thought he could not, is of no consequence. Your Lordship implies that he would not; I am bold to say he could not, and I am bolder to say even your Lordship cannot."

Whether Mr. Campbell would not answer you, I cannot tell, but that he could answer you, I feel perfectly satisfied; for his "Lectures on Poetry" would furnish any writer with sufficient *data* to set your theory at rest. In your Letter to him, you have kept aloof from an observation of his which bore heaviest on your theory. He observes in his "Essay on English Poetry," that "the faculty by which a poet luminously describes objects of art, is essentially the same faculty which enables him to be a faithful describer of simple nature." If this assertion be true, your theory avails but little, as it will be as difficult to excel in the one species as in the other; if it be not true, you ought to have disproved it in your Reply. He says, "that artificial objects and manners are of so much importance in fiction, as to make an exquisite description of them no less characteristic of genius, than the description of simple physical appearances."

To this you answer, in your "Observations on the Poetical Character of Pope, in reply to Octavius Gilchrist," that Mr. Campbell has mistaken your theory. "Mr. Campbell," you say, "judges that the exquisite description of artificial objects and manners is NOT LESS—(than what? not less poetical than exquisite descriptions of nature! no such thing;)—EXQUISITE DESCRIPTIONS of *artificial objects*, are not less CHARACTERISTIC of GENIUS than the description of *simple physical appearances!!*" The critic here confines himself to the *first part* of my proposition. Instead of answering this part, he says, the "exquisite description" of works of art, is not less characteristic of genius than descriptions of simple physical appearances! Doubtless! but one half, and that the most essential, of my proposition, is entirely omitted, and the other half mistaken. Why not take the plain words of the proposition, and answer "negatur?" Why confound the proposition by talking of "characteristics of genius?"

This, Sir, is your defence against Mr. Campbell's stricture on your theory. Whether "you would not or could not" defend it better, I will not pretend to determine; but certain I am, that two propositions were never defended worse. You say, Mr Campbell has mistaken the first part of your proposition; I say he has not; and if I had never read his criticism, I could easily perceive the impossibility of his mistaking the first part of a proposition. A proposition makes only one affirmation, and he who mistakes this affirmation, mistakes the entire at once. He cannot mistake what precedes the affirmation *per se*, for as there is nothing affirmed, there is nothing to be mistaken in it. The same argument holds good with regard to what follows the affirmation; so that it is impossible to mistake at all without mistaking the entire.

It happens, however, that the substance of your "invariable principles" are contained in two propositions, a circumstance which you might the more easily recollect, as you dignify the second with the title of *consecutive*, because, as you eloquently explain it, "it follows, and does not go before." Neither of these has been mistaken by Mr. Campbell. You merely wish them to be mistaken because they will not bear to be understood: they will not endure the light of investigation, and therefore you would wish us to believe, that whenever we detect their absurdity, it is because we do not understand them. Your first proposition says, that images from the sublime in nature are more poetical than any images drawn from art. Your second says, that natural passions are more poetical than transient manners. On the latter proposition, Mr. Campbell has indeed touched but lightly; but if he has overturned your first proposition, to what purpose do you cry out that he has omitted the other? Why are you so anxious of a defeat, that you cannot rest contented with having one of your propositions disproved? The two propositions are independent of each other, and if one of them fall, it cannot be held up by the other. When Mr. Campbell says, "that exquisite descriptions of works of art are not less characteristic of genius than descriptions of simple physical appearances," you immediately add, "doubtless." If this be doubtless, there is not the least doubt but your first proposition, at least, is frittered to shivers; and, therefore, instead of complaining, you should be thankful that he has passed over your second proposition almost unnoticed, as you might have every reason to apprehend it would meet a similar fate.

You defend your first proposition against Mr. Campbell, not by denying the truth of what he asserts, for this you admit in the most unqualified manner; but by adding that with all its truth, it is no answer to your proposition at all, that it confounds it by talking of "characteristics of genius." If, however, you reflect for a moment, you will perceive that Mr. Campbell has not mistaken or confounded your proposition by talking of "characteristics of genius." The object of your proposition was, to lay down an "invariable principle," which might serve as a test of "poetical excellency and poetical pre-eminence;" and it was by this test that you degraded Pope from the rank which he held among the English poets. Your proposition was not intended to stand *per se*, as an idle principle that was applicable to no literary purpose. The consequence to be deduced from it was obvious, and you have taken care to deduce it yourself by adding, "if this," i.e. your poetical criterion, "be admitted, the *rule* by which we would estimate Pope's general poetical character would be obvious." Whether this be obvious or not, it is as obvious as the light of heaven, that this inference which you have drawn from what you call your "mistaken" proposition, renders it a "rule by which we should estimate poetical character." For if it be applicable to Pope's poetical character, it must be equally so to that of all other poets, and consequently if it be a criterion of "poetical pre-eminence," as you elsewhere express it, it must be equally a criterion of poetical genius, which Mr. Campbell expresses by the term "characteristic of genius." If this be mistaking your proposition, you must then maintain, that though it is applicable to "Pope's poetical character or pre-eminence" as a poet, it is not at all applicable to his poetical genius; and if this be your doctrine, it is obvious that if Pope's poetical genius should rank him above Homer and Milton, it was still possible that in point of "poetical pre-eminence" he might not be qualified to rank with the veriest poetaster. Either this is your doctrine, or Mr. Campbell has not mistaken you; but if it be, I think he acted right in suffering you to enjoy in quiet, a doctrine which he could not understand, and which even the influence of the "madding hour" would never mingle with the associations of the "moon-struck prophet."

If Mr. Campbell then has mistaken your theory or proposition, it is because he could not think of attributing such a theory to any man in his senses. With regard to his omission of your consecutive proposition, I think he was not called upon to disprove what you have given up yourself, even if he had known, and you acknowledge yourself he did not know, that you had "spoken of passions as the most essential part of the higher order of poetry. I say that you have given up this proposition yourself in favor of Pope; and if so, Mr. Campbell did well to pass it by unnoticed. Let me however explain myself when I say you have given up this proposition in favor of Pope.

You admit in your "Vindication" against the "Quarterly Review," that "passions are the most essential part of the highest order of poetry.' If then it appear that Pope excelled in this "essential part," he does not come within the limits of your consecutive proposition in which the principle is laid down; and as Mr. Campbell viewed your "invariable principles" only as they affected the poetical character of Pope, he wisely omitted taking any notice of it. That Pope did excel in this "essential part of the highest order of poetry," is admitted by yourself; nor do you confine yourself to the mere admission of his excellence in the pathetic, but you say, that he was never equalled in it. The proofs of this admission follow.

The passions of general nature you distinguish into the pathetic and the sublime. To the pathetic you refer Pope's Eloisa to Abelard, and tell us that "in this poem, Pope appears on the high ground of the poet of nature. It is sufficient that nothing of the kind has ever been produced equal to it for pathos, painting, and melody. When this transcendant poem is compared with those which will bear the comparison, I shall not be deemed as giving reluctant praise when I declare my conviction of its being infinitely superior to every thing of the kind ancient or modern." Is not this admitting as clearly and as forcibly as language can admit, that Pope has far excelled all poets in "the most essential part of the highest order of poetry?" It is true you divide this part into two others—the pathetic and the sublime; but as they are the two branches into which "the most essential part of the highest order of poetry" divides itself, they must be both equally poetical, as they both proceed from the same source. If it should be disputed, however, whether the sublime or pathetic requires most poetic genius to excel in, the suffrages of the most eminent critics, and I believe, the suffrages of all who are qualified to judge, would confer the highest merit on the poet who excelled in the pathetic. It has been long agreed upon, that a good tragedy is, of all the performances of human genius, the most difficult to be accomplished. Indeed, it requires little reflection to perceive, that he who excels in the pathetic, is qualified to excel in whatever connects itself with the passions, and consequently, in the sublime; because he must be profoundly acquainted with every thing capable of affecting the human heart. And as you acknowledge passions to be the most essential part of the highest order of poetry, the pathetic must surely be the most essential part of the passions, and therefore, the most essential part of the highest order of poetry. If then no writer has ever come up to Pope in the pathetic, and if the pathetic belong, according to your own admission, to "the highest order of poetry," how sadly must you have forgot yourself, in aiming to degrade a poet whom you had yourself placed highest among the high, to an inferior order of poets! and how unnecessarily would Mr. Campbell have noticed your consecutive proposition, or defended Pope against the degradation which it fixes on poets who do not excel in what you call "the most essential part of the highest order of poetry," when you admit yourself that no poet has ever equalled him in this essential part, and that in his Eloisa to Abelard he "appears on the *high ground of the poet of nature!*" I regret that after such an admission, you should ever think of removing him from this high ground, to take his station on a lower. And I must confess I cannot suppress my indignation when I afterwards hear you condescending to acknowledge, that "there is no reason to suppose Pope more ignorant of the general feelings of nature than others." You think then that Pope is sufficiently honored by admitting that he is "not more ignorant of the general feelings of nature than others." Is this doing justice to a poet whom you have acknowledged to excel all writers ancient and modern in the pathetic, which is the very soul and essence of those "general internal feelings" of which you had not sufficient reason to pronounce him ignorant? But though you had not sufficient reasons for pronouncing him more ignorant, you had surely very sufficient reasons for pronouncing him less ignorant of those feelings than all others, if your own admissions in his favor were just. You are careful however to insinuate, that though there is no reason to suppose him more ignorant than others, there is not however any reason for supposing the contrary, as "we must estimate what he *has done*, not what he *might have* done." He has done nothing then it seems to redeem him from the suspicion of being "more ignorant of the general internal feelings of nature than others." I fear the world will never be brought to believe that these insinuations of possible ignorance, can be reconciled with poetic justice, particularly coming from a critic who admits, that "no one has touched the chords of the *pathetic* so tenderly, so *pathetically*, and so melodiously."

Mr. Campbell has quoted some of the sublimest and most generally admired passages in poetry, in which the images are taken from art. It is unnecessary for me to quote them here, because you will decompound and analyse them as a chemist would the ingredient parts of which a substance is composed, and thus trace them, by a chemical process, to nature; but you will soon perceive, that all images drawn from, and all associations connected with, or suggested by, the productions of art, must be referred to the works of art alone, and not to nature. I will, therefore, proceed to take a short view of your Reply to Lord Byron, where this truth will be more fully explained.

Though it is obvious, from what I have already advanced, that your "invariable principles of poetry" have originated either from a mistaken view of its proper nature and character, or from an affectation of adopting the tone and fashion of the times, you will not take it amiss, that I should give a specimen of the mode of reasoning which you have adopted in your Reply to Lord Byron, the sophistry of your manner, the fallacy of your conclusions, the ambiguity of your expressions, and the oppositions of meaning that characterise your assertions. I would not insinuate, that your sophistry, or ambiguity, is always intentional; but the interests of truth are equally endangered, whether they result from intention or a less intellectual cause. His Lordship commences his observations as follows:—

> "Mr. Bowles asserts, that Campbell's ship of the line derives all its poetry, not from '*art*' but from '*nature*.' 'Take away the waves, the winds, the sun, &c. &c., one will become a stripe of blue bunting, and the other a piece of coarse canvass on three tall poles.' Very true; take away the 'waves,' 'the winds,' and there will be no ship at all, not only for poetical, but for any other purpose; and take away the sun, and we must read Mr. Bowles's pamphlet by candle-light. But the poetry of the ship does not depend on the waves, &c.; on the contrary, the 'ship of the line' confers its own poetry upon the waters, and heightens theirs. Take away the 'ship of the line,' 'swinging round' the 'calm water,' and the calm water becomes a somewhat monotonous

thing to look at, particularly if not transparently clear, witness the thousands who pass by without looking on it at all. What was it that attracted the thousands to the launch? They might have seen the poetical 'calm water' at Wapping, or in the 'London Dock,' or in the Paddington Canal, or in a horse pond, or in a slop-basin, or in any other vase; they might hear the poetical 'winds' howling through the chinks of a pig-sty, or the garret-window; they might have seen the 'sun' shining on a footman's livery, or on a brass warming-pan; but could the 'calm water,' or the 'wind,' or the 'sun,' make all, or any, of these 'poetical?' I think not. Mr. Bowles admits the ship to be poetical, but only from these accessaries: now if they confer poetry so as to make one thing poetical, they would make other things poetical; the more so, as Mr. Bowles calls a 'ship of the line' without them, that is to say, its 'masts, and sails, and streamers,' 'blue bunting, and coarse canvass, and tall poles.' So they are; and porcelain is clay, and man is dust, and flesh is grass, and yet the two latter, at least, are the subject of much poetry."

This is the criticism of a philosopher as well as a poet, and it appears to me conclusive and unanswerable. But as you have attempted to answer it, I will at once state and examine the substance of your reply. It is as follows:—

"Mr. Bowles said, and says, 'that poetical beauty in a ship depends not on art, but nature.' All its poetry, he instantly admits, it does not derive from nature; but its poetical beauty depends upon nature: for the sails would not swell, the streamers would not flow, the motion would cease;—its life, which Mr. Campbell speaks of, would be extinct."

Here, Sir, I am, as usual, at a loss to discover your meaning. I have given every attention to this passage, and cannot discover the distinction which you wish to make between "poetry" and "poetical beauty." You admit, that the ship "does not derive all its poetry from nature," and maintain, with the same breath, that "its poetical beauty depends upon nature." Poetry, then, and poetical beauty are different, one depending upon nature, the other partly upon nature and partly upon something else. Here I must acknowledge you have a decided advantage over all who dare attempt to confute this vindication of your principles; for till we can first distinguish between "poetry" and "poetical beauty," we can never prove you to be in error, simply because we do not understand what you mean; and, not understanding it, who would presume to suppose, that you did not understand it yourself, and that the meaning you attached to it was not as logical and conclusive, and as demonstratively proved in your own imagination, as any proposition in Euclid. I cannot, however, help thinking, that when you commenced your Reply to Lord Byron in this strain of desperate obscurity, you were so perplexed and confused, that you

> ——gnaw'd your pen, then dash'd it on the ground,
> Sinking from thought to thought, a vast profound,
> Plunged for your sense, but found no better there;
> Yet wrote, and flounder'd on, in mere despair.

Perhaps you may retort, however, upon me, and, through me, on all who have hitherto objected to your invariable principles, should I acknowledge the impossibility of disproving your defence from its impenetrable obscurity, and cry out

> O Cara! Cara! silence all that train:
> Joy to great Chaos! let division reign.

If you should be so disposed, you may enjoy, in peace, a triumph which you owe, not to your knowledge, but to your ignorance, of the subject in which you were engaged. To give you, however, as little room for exultation as possible, I will endeavour to squeeze out of this passage all the meaning which can possibly be extracted from it.

You tell us, then, that all the "poetry" of the ship is not derived from nature; but that "its poetical beauty" is derived from that source alone. Now, as you always complain of not being understood, and as every new defence of yours presents your meaning in a different shape, I must observe, that by "its poetical beauty" you either mean, all its poetical beauty, or you mean nothing; for if you only mean a part of its poetical beauty, the sense will run thus: All its poetry it does not derive from nature, but a part of its poetical beauty does depend upon nature. If this be the sense, I reply again, it is no sense, or nonsense; for as the conjunction *but* is introduced to draw a distinction between the preceding and subsequent propositions, the sentence can have no meaning, if such a distinction does not exist. That it does not exist is obvious; for to say that it does not derive all its poetry from nature, is equivalent to saying, that it derives a part of it from nature. If, then, it derives a part of its poetry and a part of its poetical beauty from nature, there can be no distinction intended, and the word *but* can have no meaning, as it is nonsense to say it derives a part of its poetry from nature, *but* it derives a part of its poetical beauty from nature. It is, then, demonstratively certain, that by "its poetical beauty" you mean *all* its poetical beauty, or you mean nothing; and if you mean nothing, it is unnecessary to contend with you. If, then, you mean any thing, you mean, that all the poetical beauty of the ship depends upon nature, but that all its poetry does not; and, consequently, you admit that poetry and poetical beauty are different. But as poetical beauty means only the beauty of poetry, it equally follows that there may be poetry without any beauty. If there be so, it can only be such poetry as suits your "invariable principles;" and I doubt whether you will find many to admire principles of poetry that require no poetical beauty. Horace denies there can be any thing like poetical mediocrity—

> ————Mediocribus esse poetis,
> Non Dii, non homines, non concessere columnæ.

And with this judgment of Horace, all writers and critics have unanimously agreed. If you object to the universal authority of all writers, it is needless to contend with you on the subject; but if you admit this authority, you must equally admit, that you have evaded the force of Lord Byron's criticism, by affecting to draw a line of distinction, where there was no distinction in nature.

Again, if all the poetical beauty of the ship depends upon nature, at least you will allow, that the ship is the subject of this poetical beauty, and, therefore, all the poetical beauty of the subject depends upon nature. How, then, will you reconcile this with what you have advanced in the commencement of your "invariable principles," where you say, "Let me not, however, be considered as thinking, that the subject alone constitutes poetical excellency: the execution is to be taken into consideration at the same time?" If, then, the execution be as necessary as the subject, to constitute poetical excellency, how can you reply to Lord Byron, that all the poetical beauty of the ship depends upon nature? If it does so depend, the execution goes for nothing, as nature renders the subject poetically beautiful without it. It is evident, then, that your theory falls of itself, and that your principles are not only at variance, but absolute negations of each other; and it is equally evident, that you wish to have nothing to do with the execution at all if you can help it; and that though you have once vouchsafed to take it into consideration, you are determined to consider it as little, and to keep it out of sight as much, as you possibly can. Indeed, nothing can be more favorable to the empire of dulness than to propagate an opinion, that poetry derives none of its poetical beauty from the execution or skill of the poet, and that it is the nature of the subject that determines all. If this doctrine were once established, every dunce could rival Homer and Milton, by adopting one or other of your poetical subjects where all the images and passions would be taken from nature; for as all the poetical beauty of the subject would depend upon nature, and not upon them, it would matter little what poverty of genius they betrayed in the execution.

You admitted, then, in your Observations on the Poetical Character of Pope, that "the subject alone does not constitute poetical excellency;" but in your Reply to Lord Byron, you turn round, and maintain that it does. But you are not satisfied with denying, in your Reply, what you had admitted in your Observations; but you admit in the very same sentence of your Reply what you had denied in your Observations. In your Reply you admit, the ship "does not derive all its poetry from nature," by which you would insinuate, that it derives part of it from the execution; but in your Observations, as stated in page 6, you say, that "the subject is to be considered respecting the poetry, and the execution respecting the art and powers of the poet;" that is, that the poetry is to be attributed to the subject alone, and not to the execution. If then the poetry is to be attributed to the subject alone, must not the poetry of the ship be ascribed to the ship alone? and yet you evade the force of Lord Byron's criticism, by seeming to admit, that the ship derives a part of its poetry from the execution; a position which you had already denied when you attributed all the poetry to the subject alone, and no part of it to the execution.

But how do you attempt to show that the poetical beauty of the ship depends upon nature? By an argument indeed worthy of a desperate cause! "Its poetical beauty," you say, "depends upon nature, for the sails would not swell, the streamers would not flow, the motion would cease, its life, which Mr. Campbell speaks of, would be extinct." This argument is like one of the quibbles of the ancient schoolmen: in its nature it is the same, and differs from them only in not possessing that subtlety and ingenuity which characterised theirs. It is indeed in Mr. Bowles's worst style of reasoning, and proves him reduced to a shift. You did not perceive, that if the ship derives all its poetical beauty from nature, because, without nature, the sails would not swell, the streamers would not flow, &c. the ship itself must necessarily be the work of nature, and not of art. This can be proved in a moment by your own mode of reasoning, the great virtue of which would be universally acknowledged, were it universally known, that it can prove the works of art to be mere productions of nature. That the ship is the work of nature, according to your mode of reasoning, must appear evident; for if nature did not produce wood, and all the original materials of which a ship is built—if the mind of man, which is the work of nature, did not discover the means of preparing these materials—if it did not devise and frame the instruments by which they were fashioned and framed into a ship, such a thing as a ship would never have existed. A ship, then, is the work of nature; and yet you yourself acknowledge it to be the work of art. According to your argument, however, it cannot be; and therefore you must abandon the proposition which you deduced from it, namely, that the "poetical beauty of the ship depends upon nature;" or otherwise contradict yourself, when you admitted the ship to be the work of art, by maintaining now that a ship is not the work of art, but of nature.

To grant, however, all that can rationally be conceded to you, I willingly admit, that a ship is originally the work of nature, that all things are originally the works of nature, or, at least, all things of which we are enabled to take cognisance, "that the sails would not swell, the streamers would not flow, the motion would cease," without the agency of nature; but, with all these concessions, your argument goes for nothing. The use of words is to express such simple or compound ideas as men have agreed to attach to them, not such ideas as are philosophically true. Accordingly, we have many words that express ideas which are only the creatures of our own minds, and which have no foundation in the true and proper nature of things. Extraordinary is a word which we use to express the emotion felt at the presence of something unaccountable. From our ignorance of its cause, we feel as if it were produced contrary to the order of nature—as if it were a monster in the creation. But this emotion is founded in delusion; for there can be no effect without an adequate cause to produce it; and the moment we are made perfectly acquainted with the cause, we perceive there is nothing in it extraordinary. But though there is nothing extraordinary, yet the term is properly used, because it expresses an idea which, though founded in delusion, has its existence in the mind. To every word we should, therefore, attach that rigid and exact association of ideas which it suggests to the minds of men in general, or, in other words, that association of ideas which men, in general, have covenanted to attach to it. When a ship, therefore, is said to be a work of art, we only mean to say, that it is the work of man. It is true that man could never have made a ship unless nature had furnished him with the materials; but this is a consideration which the mind does not include in its idea of a ship; and, therefore, though it be a truth, it is a truth that has no concern with the idea that mankind have agreed to attach to the term. It would, therefore, be absurd to say that a ship is the work of nature, because the idea we attach to it is limited to the notion of its being the work of man, the creations of whose genius we call works of art. Whatever ideas, then, are immediately suggested to us by a ship, are the ideas that properly belong to it, and we must never trace them beyond the ship, the very name of which is the sole cause of suggesting the ideas. As a ship, *therefore*, suggests the idea of sails swelling, of streamers flowing, as well as the ideas of life and motion, these ideas are to be attributed to the ship alone, and not to nature. It is not nature that suggests them to the mind, but the ship; though it is nature that partly produces the effect. The mind, however, never thinks of nature, nor of the remote causes by which the effects are produced. It looks only to the object which immediately suggested or awoke the ideas themselves. You may prove, then, that it is nature that swells the sails, that makes the streamers flow, that gives the ship life and motion; but unless you prove that it is nature suggests the idea of swelling sails, flowing streamers, &c. you employ your logic to little purpose. Whatever object awakens these ideas in the mind is the object to which the mind attributes them, and it is idle to look for their source in remote causes, of which mankind never think, when the ideas are present to their mind.

Besides, you should reflect, that if we were to view the question, not as philologers or poets, but as pure, abstract reasoners, who trace all effects to their ultimate causes, (and the history of literature sufficiently proves that such reasoners have been always the most wretched judges of poetry,) even in this case, the swelling of the sails, the flowing of the streamers, the life and motion of the ship, would not be entirely the work of nature, and if not, the poetical beauty of the ship could not entirely depend upon nature. That this swelling of the sails and flowing of the streamers are not entirely the work of nature is obvious; for the sails would not swell, nor would the streamers flow, if the artist had not accommodated their texture and pliancy to the action and elasticity of the air; so that, even viewing the question in the same point of view with yourself, the swelling of the sails, and the flowing of the streamers, are as much owing to art as to nature; and if so, the proposition is doubly erroneous which asserts that the poetical beauty of the ship depends upon nature alone.

You will perceive that I have here used poetical beauty in the same sense with yourself, though I have already proved, that there is no poetical beauty, no poetical sublimity, no poetical object of any description, in all the works of nature or of art. I have, therefore, granted poetical beauty to belong to a ship, merely to confute you, even on that imaginary ground on which you have taken your station, and to show, that if the beauty of a ship could be called poetical, still this poetical beauty would belong to art alone. The real beauty of a ship, and of all the works of nature, is merely sensible beauty. Poetical beauty is the creature of the mind alone. It is not the real image of the beautiful object, but such an image of it as the poet thinks proper to represent. And as this image is the mere offspring of mental associations, it is obvious, that poetical beauty is to be traced to the operations of the mind alone, selecting from sensible and intellectual beng such images of matter and affections of mind, as she thinks best qualified to elicit such mental emotions as she intends to excite.

"Take away the waves, the winds," says Lord Byron, "and there will be no ship at all, not only for poetical, but for any other purpose." To which you think it sufficient to reply, "then its very existence depends upon them." But do you seriously think this reply satisfactory, or can you possibly have any doubt of what Lord Byron asserts—that the existence of the ship depends upon "the wind and waves?" Who would ever think of building a ship if there had been neither wind nor waves? So far from building such a machine; the very idea of it would have never suggested itself to mankind.

To your argument, that the ship owes all its poetical beauty to the sun, wind, and waves, Lord Byron replies—"If the waves had only foam upon their bosoms—if the winds only wafted the sea-weed to the shore—if the sun shone neither upon pyramids nor fleets, nor fortresses, would its beams be equally poetical?" to which you triumphantly reply;—If it (the sun) shone upon none of the emmets of earth, man, or his little works, it would be equally a stupendous object in the visible creation, *per se*, abstractedly, and equally sublime; "and it would be poetical, equally poetical, whether it shone on pyramids or posts, fortresses or pig-sties," a "brass warming pan, or a footman's livery, though neither pig-sties nor posts could be sublime or beautiful with or without it."

The absurdity of this defence is so obvious, that I doubt whether it is worth commenting upon. You tell us, that if the sun never shone upon man, "it would be equally a stupendous object, *per se*, abstractedly, and equally sublime." Pray, Mr. Bowles, if the sun "never shone upon man or his little works," to whom would it be sublime or stupendous? To man it could be neither one nor the other, if it never shone upon him; for in this case, the earth would be enveloped in darkness, and man never attached the idea of sublimity to a material object which he never perceived. Neither could it be sublime to the brute creation, for, so far as we are acquainted with the modes and limits of their perceptions, the idea of sublimity is an idea of which they never formed any conception. It could not be sublime to any higher order of being than man, if it never shone, because it is its resplendent light that renders it sublime; nor can you tell whether, with all its splendor, it is sublime to any order of being but man himself. The sun, for ought that either you or I know, may appear like a dim lamp, compared to the insufferable splendor, magnitude, and magnificence of other orbs; and if so, they would not deem it either stupendous or sublime. The same reasoning which led you to suppose, that objects have a *per se*, or abstract poetical beauty in themselves, has also led you to suppose, that objects, and the words which express them, have also a *per se* or abstract sublimity, unconnected with the perceptions, feelings, emotions, passions, and sympathies of man. You do not seem to be aware, that when an object is pronounced sublime, this sublimity merely expresses, that the object has the quality of producing a certain emotion in the mind of man, which he expresses by the term sublime. It would, however, be absurd to suppose, that an object will produce the same emotion in other beings that it produces in us; for the nature of every emotion is determined by the mutual relation that exists between the natural sensibilities of the percipient, and the qualities of the thing perceived. Now, as the natural sensibilities or sensations of every being vary with its natural organisation, or original structure, and as this original structure is different in all the different species of animated being, it necessarily follows, that the same object will excite different sensations in all the different classes or tribes of animals to which it is presented, and consequently, the emotion to which we attach the term sublime, will not be the emotion produced in any other being but ourselves, because no other being is originally constituted like man. If you can point out any other being similarly constituted, I say that being is a man, in the strictest sense of the expression. A turkey-cock will fly at a person who wears a red mantle, because this color produces a disagreeable sensation in him, which is not felt by other animals. The meaning of words, therefore, must be universally understood, with regard to the perceptions which they convey to, and the sensations, emotions or passions which they excite in, the mind of man alone. Words have no meaning in themselves abstractedly; for there can be no affinity between a sound and an idea. They derive their meaning, therefore, from a mere arbitrary convention; from an agreement among mankind to attach certain ideas to certain vocal sounds. But as the objects or qualities that excite these ideas in us, would produce different ideas in other beings, they would use different words to express them, or attach a different meaning to the words which are adopted by us. If the object that produces a sensation of disgust in us, produce a sensation of pleasure or luxury in another animal, it is obvious, that if these animals, (supposing them gifted with language) and we, express these different sensations by the same word, we must attach different ideas to it. When, therefore, we call the sun a sublime object, we deceive ourselves in supposing that the word sublimity has any meaning abstracted from the emotion which it produces in ourselves, as it would not produce the same emotion in any other being. If the sun then never shone upon man, it is absurd, in the highest degree, to say that it would still be stupendous and sublime, as these are terms that express emotions peculiar to man alone.

But to what purpose do you maintain that the sun would be stupendous and sublime, whatever it shone upon, or if it did not shine at all? Lord Byron never asserted the contrary: he only said, it would not be as *poetical*, if it had neither pyramids nor fleets, nor fortresses to shine upon. Is this assertion disproved by saying it would be stupendous and sublime? If you think there is no difference between a stupendous and a poetical object: if you claim the liberty of confounding terms so perfectly distinct in their nature, you may argue to eternity without any danger of being confuted; for there is no arguing with a man who attaches what ideas he pleases to the expressions which he makes use of. But the sun, you add, "would be equally poetical, whether it shone on pyramids or posts, fortresses or pig-sties, a brass warming-pan, or a footman's livery." It is curious, that you should quote two lines, almost immediately after making this assertion, which prove its absurdity. Trying the poetical effect of the sun, you compare the two following lines:

> The Sun shines white upon the rocks—
> The Sun shines white upon the warming-pan.

The first of these lines you consider poetical, but the second you do not, though you told us immediately before that the sun is equally poetical whether it shines upon pyramids or a brass warming-pan. Who can understand such logic? or to what purpose are we told, that the sun is poetical whatever it shines upon, whether on pig-sties or a brass warming-pan, when you tell us, the moment you make it shine "upon the warming-pan," that it is no longer poetical? It seems then that a brass warming-pan, notwithstanding your logic, has the power of destroying the poetry of the sun. Yet I suspect that Pope could bring the sun and the warming-pan together in such a manner, that without destroying the poetry of the sun, he would make both it and the warming-pan poetical at the same moment, though they have both lost their poetry in your hands;—a proof that the poetry of objects is neither to be sought for in themselves, nor in the mere act of bringing them together; and that it has its origin in the *manner* alone in which they are associated.

Perhaps you will reply, that Pope could not make the sun poetical shining on a warming-pan, that it is poetical in verse only when it shines on natural objects, and that therefore though it is not poetical shining upon the warming-pan, it is exceedingly so shining upon the rocks. To this I have only to reply, that if you will not admit the sun shining upon the warming-pan to be poetical, after telling us it would be poetical, stupendous, and sublime, whether it shines on warming-pans or pig-sties, or if it never shone at all upon man or any of his works; at least you must admit that its being a work of art cannot prevent it from being a poetical object; unless you maintain, that the first of the two following lines is not poetical, though you have immediately after quoted it as such, in making an experiment with the "evening beam," for no purpose that I can perceive, but that of turning your own theory into ridicule; or at least of placing its absurdity in the most conspicuous point of view.

> Pale on the lone tower falls the evening beam—
> Pale on my grey wig falls the evening beam.

The first of these lines you call poetical, and so it unquestionably is; but is not the "lone tower," on which the evening beam rests, as much the work of art as your unpoetical grey wig? And is it not more poetical than the evening beam itself, though an image taken from one of the sublimest objects in nature? Who then can decide when the sun is or is not poetical, if we are to be guided by your invariably erroneous and discordant principles?

"Mr. Campbell," you say, "introduced the sun needlessly, if it did not make the ship more poetical." But, as Lord Byron justly observes, if it makes one thing poetical, why not another? The observation is philosophically just; and therefore the question may be repeated, if it has rendered Mr. Campbell's ship poetical, why has it not had the same effect on your grey wig and warming-pan? And yet you confidently tell us, this is an argument unworthy of Lord Byron. Would you condescend to tell us why it is unworthy of him? I suspect you would more willingly have us believe it so, than be obliged to tell the reason. You must, however, be content to admit with Lord Byron, that if the sun makes one thing poetical, it will have the same effect upon another, till you assign a reason for disagreeing with him. If you could evade the force of an argument by saying it is unworthy, it is absurd, you could easily confute all the logicians and metaphysicians that ever wrote. The truth is, you saw Lord Byron's argument unanswerable, and you dexterously slipped away from it, by affecting to think it unworthy of an answer.

Lord Byron asks, "Did any painter ever paint the sea *only*, without the addition of a ship, boat, wreck, or some such adjunct?" To prove that such adjuncts are not necessary to render the sea poetical, you quote the following passage from Crabbe, in which there is neither ship nor wreck introduced:

> With ceaseless motion comes and goes the tide;
> Flowing it fills the channel, vast and wide;
> Then back to sea, with strong majestic sweep
> It rolls, in ebb, yet terrible and deep.

A school-boy could perceive, that this is not a description of the sea, but of the flowing and ebbing of the tide up and down the channel; which presents a picture to the mind very different from a broad, extended, monotonous sheet of water. This, however, you are pleased to call a description of the sea, and a description too, which "might rival the greatest poet that ever lived." And you particularly direct his Lordship's attention to its "metre and imagery." Now, Sir, without the remotest intention of derogating from the poetical powers of Crabbe, I must say, that the description appears to me totally destitute of imagery, and therefore so extremely bleak and cheerless, that it has scarcely any thing in it to constitute poetry but the metre itself. Imagery, in poetry, is not the mere picture or image of the object described, but kindred images, taken from other objects in the works of nature or of art, in which the object described is clothed and decorated. But what images are introduced into this description of the tide, but what absolutely belong to it, and which watermen and fishwomen are every day attributing to it, except the epithet "majestic" alone? All the other qualities and attributes conferred upon it, such as coming, going, flowing, filling, vast, wide, deep, terrible, are only what strikes every observer the moment he looks upon it. Besides, though the description is so short, the poet, for want of imagery, has been obliged to express the same thought twice over. First he represents the tide coming and going, and finishes his description by expressing the same thought over again in different words. The descriptive terms are all general, and an object described in general terms was never poetically described. Lord Kames, in his "Elements of Criticism," lays it down as a rule, "to avoid, as much as possible, general and abstract terms. Images, which are the life of poetry, cannot be raised in any perfection, but by introducing particular objects." This rule is completely violated in Crabbe's description of the tide, which, notwithstanding, you say, "might rival the greatest poet that ever lived." So you are pleased to think; but I suspect few of your readers would compare it with the following description of a sea-view from Dover-cliffs. Observe, *en passant,* how accurately Shakspeare observes Lord Kames' "rule" though he had never read his "Elements of Criticism."

——————— How fearful
And dizzy 'tis to cast one's eyes so low,
The crows and choughs that wing the midway air
Shew scarce so gross as beetles. Half-way down
Hangs one that gathers samphire; dreadful trade!
Methinks he seems no bigger than his head.
The fishermen that walk upon the beach
Appear like mice; and yon tall anchoring bark
Diminish'd to her cock; her cock a buoy
Almost too small for sight. The murmuring surge,
That on the unnumber'd idle pebbles chafes,
Cannot be heard so high. I'll look no more,
Lest my brain turn, and the deficient sight
Topple down headlong. *King Lear, Act 4, sc. 6.*

This, Sir, is what I should call imagery; and I believe you will yourself readily acknowledge, that it is infinitely more poetical than Crabbe's description, in which there is no image presented to the imagination but the tide coming and going, and coming and going, and consequently almost as monotonous as the sea itself, without a ship, boat, or any other adjunct.

But you have not yet done with the sea and the ships: you quote another passage from Lord Byron himself; but for what purpose it is doubtful whether any person can tell but yourself. Your object was to disprove his Lordship's argument, when he says, that no "painter ever painted the sea *only* without the addition of a ship, boat, wreck, or some such adjunct." And in order to disprove the assertion, you quote the following description of the sea from "Childe Harold," in which the imagery is highly and poetically enriched with ships, breezes, sails, masts, spires, bows, convoys, swans, sailors, waves, prows, &c. This indeed you might have justly called a description that "might rival the greatest poet that ever lived."

He that has sail'd upon the dark blue sea,
Has view'd at times, I ween, a full fair sight;
When the fresh breeze is fair as breeze may be,
The white sail set, the gallant frigate tight,
Masts, spires, and strand, retiring to the right;
The glorious main expanding o'er the bow,
The convoy spread like wild swans in their flight;
The dullest sailor wearing bravely now,
So gaily curl the waves before each dashing prow.

Who can be so profoundly dull as not to perceive, that this passage glows with all the life and animation of poetry; and that it derives this animation from the picturesque imagery of the poet?

And yet you deny itto be more poetical than if the sea was described without a ship, boat, or any other adjunct: these, you say, make it only more picturesque, but not more poetical. Pray can you seriously talk thus after the following notice prefixed to your reply? "It would be important for the reader to keep in mind one plain distinction in reading what is here offered. Whatever is picturesque is so far poetical, but all that is poetical does not require to be picturesque." If then, Sir, whatever is picturesque be also poetical, how is it that a picturesque description of the sea does not render it more poetical than it is already; and how is it that this picturesque description of Lord Byron's is not more poetical than if it had been totally destitute of all imagery?

But the elements of discord have not yet ceased; you add proposition to proposition only to fill up the measure of your absurdity. You tell us that Pope's descriptive poems "will always appear defective to a lover of nature," because from infirmities and from physical causes, he was particularly deficient in his picturesque descriptions; and yet, *mirabile dictu*, you maintain that Lord Byron's description of the sea is not rendered more poetical by its being picturesque. Lord Byron's poetry then gains nothing by his having that "attentive eye and familiarity with external nature," the want of which is the only cause you ascribe for Pope's failure in descriptive poetry.

I will here, Sir, take leave of you, nor pursue you farther through the wilderness of argument that characterises your Reply to Lord Byron. I have, in the first place, proved the fallacy of your theory;—I have proved that there is not a poetical object in the works of nature or of art; I have proved that the objects which you call poetical, have no poetry in description, abstracted from the manner in which they are associated by the poet; and that where the manner is not poetical, the description will be prosaic, however thickly it may be sown with your poetical images, and that consequently, in all cases, it is the mânner alone that constitutes "poetical pre-eminence." If I have proved these points clearly and satisfactorily, it follows, that your Reply to Lord Byron must be sophistical, in proportion as it is specious; for where the fundamental principles of a theory are erroneous, it is obvious that it can be defended only by torture of expression, ambiguity of meaning, or that speciousness of argument which enrobes error in the vestments of truth, and conceals its fallacies by the lights and shades of an ingenious dialectic. To prove that this is the character of your Defence, I have given a specimen of the mode of reasoning which you have adopted in your Reply, first to Mr. Campbell, and afterwards to Lord Byron. His Lordship commenced his strictures on your "invariable principles," by a defence of Mr. Campbell's "Ship of the Line," which you say "totally failed as described by himself," and as defended by his Lordship; but though you imagine you have proved your proposition, to use your own expression, "to the right and to the left," and "blown away" his Lordship's argument "to the winds," the public will have little difficulty in perceiving, by what masterly evolutions and involutions of argument you have justified your boast.

THE

RETURN TO NATURE;

OR,

A DEFENCE

OF THE

VEGETABLE REGIMEN;

WITH SOME ACCOUNT OF AN EXPERIMENT MADE DURING THE LAST THREE OR FOUR YEARS IN THE AUTHOR'S FAMILY.

> Man, only man, Creation's Lord confess'd,
> Amidst his happy realm remains unbless'd;
> On the bright earth, his flow'r-embroider'd throne,
> Th' imperial mourner reigns and weeps alone.
> SPENCER'S YEAR OF SORROW.

BY JOHN FRANK NEWTON, ESQ.

[*Concluded from No. XXXIX.*]

LONDON:

1822.

DEFENCE, &c.

The fallacy which, whether advisedly or not, is carried on by the faculty, resembles what took place in this country three or four hundred years ago, when all England was Roman Catholic in its religious faith. As a man then retired with his confessor to receive from him such absolutions and promises as we have since discovered the priest had no divine commission to dispense; so now, the physician is resorted to for consolations of another kind, which, God knows, it is as little in the good man's power to realise. These wretched deceits will probably at some future day be regarded in the same light.

It would be an almost endless task to repeat the just sarcasms that have been printed, from Garth to Gregory, on the arrogant pretensions, or rather the legitimate practice of the learned in physic. I have for them neither room nor inclination; but so deep an impression must they, I conceive, have left on the minds of those who have had the amusement of perusing them, that the professors of medicine, as of magic, ought in their modesty to excuse it, if, after a long experience and exposure of the impotence of their respective arts, the thinking part of mankind should no longer consider such proficients as holding, like the Fates, the threads of life and death in their unhallowed hands. Great reason there is indeed to suspect, and I willingly state it in justice to the faculty, that many among them, whose judgment has been much looked up to, have had no very sanguine faith in the power of medicine. It would scarcely be going too far to assert, that there never lived any physician of high repute who was not a sceptic in his science. The exhibitions which have maintained the fame of medical skill have been those of opium, sulphur, and mercury: how much they have contributed to preserve life where it would otherwise have been sacrificed, shall be left to those whose practical experience better qualifies them to decide the point; but I have heard it confidently asserted that the bills of mortality in a given population, I speak of that of Spain and Portugal for example, have been nearly the same under the bleeding system which once prevailed so extensively in Europe, as they now are under a comparative abolition of that innocent practice. I was thus proceeding to examine how far what are called improvements in medicine had substantially contributed to the prolongation of life, when the postman rapped at my door with a letter from a country cousin of mine, of whom I had little idea that she ever turned her thoughts to these serious subjects. The reader will, I trust, have some indulgence for an unpractised pen, and under that impression, I venture to give my fair friend's composition just as it came to my hands.

"DEAR COUSIN,

"As you reside in London, I will make no apology for giving you the trouble of delivering the inclosed letter to some members of the learned bodies to whom it is addressed; and if a satisfactory answer can be obtained, pray lose no time in forwarding it to

"Your's," &c.

" *To the learned Members of the College of Physicians, the College of Surgeons, and Apothecaries of Great Britain.*

"GENTLEMEN,

"Having read with some attention Dr. Lambe's works on Constitutional Diseases and on Cancer, I candidly confess that the novelty of his theory, unsupported by a sufficient number of successful cases, puzzled my poor understanding.[1] Feeling, however, favorably disposed towards a system so simple, and apparently so innocent, I looked with considerable anxiety for a solution of my doubts to your respectable body, whose opinions on the subject I am at length happy to find pretty widely circulated. *You* will readily believe that the veneration, I may almost say the prejudice, which prevails in favor of your learning and devotion to the public weal even when opposed to your interests, could not fail to influence my judgment in an appeal to your's. Imagine then the dilemma in which I was placed on recalling to mind the opposition which inoculation for the small pox received about a century ago, and also that which vaccination has encountered during the last ten years, not only from the unlettered part of the community, but from some respected names on your lists. Unwilling to attribute this opposition to any other motive than a love of truth, I was compelled to suspect the soundness of your judgment; for inoculation, after severe struggles, conquered all its adversaries, and vaccination was unfortunately supported by thousands of successful experiments, and eagerly adopted on the continent of Europe, while it was still controverted here.

---

[1] With due deference to my pleasant relation under Dover Cliff, I conceive that Dr. Lambe's success in arresting the progress of cancer, as detailed in the cases which he has given to the public, was such as to impress every understanding.

"Unable to solve my difficulties through the assistance of your learned colleges, and being myself wholly ignorant of medicine, I enquired whether cancer was generally thought a fatal disease; or whether any mode of cure had hitherto been discovered? I was answered that there had not. I then asked whether any cancer-patients in the hospitals had been treated by the faculty on Dr. Lambe's system? Another negative confirmed my surprise. Bewildered in my inquiries, I sought in vain for a justification of the inveterate hostility, contempt, and ridicule, both written and verbal, with which Dr. Lambe's theory has been assailed. Is there a suspicion, said I, that pure water can add to the catalogue of our diseases? Or can a vegetable diet, which has carried so many men to an age exceeding a century, be dreaded as having a tendency to curtail our existence? In this embarrassment, an evil spirit approached my ear, and whispered these unwelcome words. 'Vain mortal! dismiss your doubts: the faculty neither wish to kill nor cure. The diseases, the ignorance, the prejudices of the mass, are essential to *their* prosperity; and woe to him who should attempt to dispel either. He shall suffer a permanent crucifixion, if his philosophy place him not beyond the reach of their vengeance. As reasonably might you expect a modern lawyer to imitate the immortal Sir Thomas More, and dissuade his client from entering into a chancery-suit; or a nobleman to strip himself of his trappings, and descend to the condition of a peasant, as a sane physician[1] to become an honest man.'

"Awakened from a dream in which I had at least the consolation of believing that the physicians were as much the guardians of our health, as the lawyers of our property, or the priests of our souls, I must now, gentlemen, solicit your attention to the most obstinate of all maladies, of which I live the victim, *a want of faith.*

---

[1] Right, right, my good cousin! He knows perfectly well, when he advises his luxurious patient *not to live too low*, the complacency with which his prescription is received; and that to divulge the secret and become a propagator of truth, might cost him his carriage, his wines, his abundant table, and his liveried servants.

"A FEMALE SCEPTIC."

"*Dover Cliff, January* 6, 1811.

It has been often said of vegetable diet, that it is not so strengthening as animal food, and I will readily grant that the latter imparts a temporary increase of strength: so likewise does the rage of a madman, though his is perhaps the highest state of diseased action; but that vigor and energy which are the prelude to ulterior mischief, had better never have existed. The man whom Sir Edward Berry prevailed upon to live on partridges alone, and who was obliged after the first week to desist on account of the appearance of symptoms of putrefaction, might probably during that week, in which he was approaching fast towards death, have been conscious of an accession of strength. But let me ask, are not the lower orders of Irish, who live on potatoes[1] and buttermilk, as strong as any race of men in Europe? They are vigorous even to a proverb. If they are not entirely as long-lived or as healthy as they might be, which is I suppose the fact, it is because they neither abstain from spirits nor common water; and even with these disadvantages, if a man remarkable for the largeness of his limbs be exhibited in London, it is ten to one that he comes from the sister kingdom. We find in Ulloa's book on South America that men may be abundantly sustained on vegetables. He tells us that the instances are common on that continent, of persons in good health at a hundred years of age, and not rare, at a hundred and thirty or forty. The habits of the Spaniards are very different from our own. Those who have penetrated into Spain have probably witnessed to what a distance a Spanish attendant will accompany on foot a traveller's mule or carriage; not less than forty or fifty miles a day, raw onions and bread being his only fare. This observation is offered with that view to moderation which the writer has endeavoured never to lose sight of in the statements contained in this little treatise. There are those who will be aware that still stronger facts, entirely to his present purpose, might have been adduced, relatively to more distant parts of the world as well as to Spain. He will content himself with barely naming La Peyrouse, Molina, and Humboldt; for if he were to enter fully into all the details which press upon him in the consideration of this extensive subject, he would produce a large book, the evil he is most anxious to avoid. These travellers, who are always consulted with new pleasure, agree in remarking the prodigious change which is effected in nations, simply by the introduction of domestic animals.

---

[1] In the "Narrative of a Voyage of Discovery by Lieut. James Grant," published in 1803, I meet with the following passage at p. 179, "We found an American ship lying here, called The Washington of Nantucket. Her commander, Jedediah Fitz, informed me that the American sailors had discovered potatoes eaten raw to be a very powerful antiscorbutic, and that their whaling vessels constantly took a quantity with them to sea to eat raw, as an antidote against the scurvy."

A few years' steady preseverance in the use of fruits and raw vegetables, unmixed with any other liquid or substance, would bring the body into a state in which it would be incapable of ulceration.

If it be admitted that vegetable diet, as the Spaniard Ulloa, the German Haller, and our own John Hunter and Abernethy have stated,[1] is fully equal to support men under all necessary exertions, I conceive it will also be granted, that being our natural sustenance, it will so purify the blood that we shall not only enjoy better health, but shall also be rendered less accessible to infectious disorders than if we lived on the flesh of animals. We Englishmen, who rival all nations in attachment to solid food, are remarkably subject to perish by contagion in hot climates; whereas Timoni, in his account of the plague at Constantinople, relates that the Armenians, who chiefly live on vegetables, are far less liable to the disease than the other inhabitants of that city. The evidences, indeed, are incontrovertible which go to establish that the susceptibility of infection depends upon the bodily state in which those happen to be who are in the way of it; and when we say that certain people are more or less affected with any disorder according to their constitutions, I should question whether we really mean any thing else than that they are affected in proportion to the quantity of morbific matter in their systems which finds no other vent. It is well understood in the hospitals that puerperal fever is infectious to none but lying-in women; and it is equally well known that in the same house, and under similar circumstances of exposure, some persons take an infectious disease, while others escape it.[1] I would not at present go so far as to state roundly that contagion is altogether the offspring of this species of civilisation into which men have been betrayed, because I would avoid the declaration of bold and novel opinions as much as possible; but to me I confess it appears that in the theory of the communication of infectious disorders we are on the eve of some important discoveries. Any man descended from a long line of ancestors who had lived as Dr. Lambe would have us all live, could scarcely be liable to contagion of any kind: his frame would be an unfit receptacle for this artificial poison.

---

[1] The author is acquainted with a lady, who, having been always very anxious to suckle her children herself instead of making over her duties to other women, under the conviction that if there is on earth a right of property which no ingenuity can successfully controvert, *it is the claim of an infant to the milk in its mother's breast*, has nursed her last child, while she was living on vegetables and distilled water, till he was two years old. This lady accomplished her purpose much better in this instance than in any former attempt. She enjoyed during the period of nursing, and has since enjoyed, excellent health; and as to the child, he is all that one can wish a child to be.

What a prospect does it open to mankind, should it be no irrational hope that the monster syphilis, with all its gorgon terrors, may yet be driven from the earth. This scourge of the human race, respecting the origin of which there has been so much dispute,[2] arose in all likelihood from an exacerbation of the arsenical state of the fluids produced about the year fifteen hundred by the heat of the southern climates on unhealthy bodies, which were unaccustomed to the ardent sunshine[3] of South America. The afflicting malady appears to have first broken out among the Spaniards three centuries ago, when they acted in those regions that dreadful tragedy which will be an eternal stain upon our species; a refinement of cruelties which the conscious historian has been unable to veil, and for which no sufferings can atone—a scene of horror, that has called down from its heavenly mansion the spirit of Montezuma, to hover o'er the blood which long shall deluge the guilty peninsula.

Thus we see it happen in the islands of the West Indies. Frequently does the stoutest looking European sicken soon after his arrival from Europe, and die before he has been on shore six weeks; the great heat of that climate, under which a disciple of Pythagoras would feel himself at ease, being a sufficient excitement fatally to set at work the principle of death within him. Such accidents were often witnessed before the yellow fever was known in the West Indies. It is pretty generally allowed that the venereal disease existed not in the new world before Columbus crossed the Atlantic. One of the three writers lately mentioned,

---

[1] Owing probably to the state of the chymical attractions of those bodies. Besides, there are many influences and operations constantly proceeding around us which have escaped, and may for ever escape, the most acute human intellect.

[2] Lord Bacon would have found nothing absurd in tracing this complaint to the use of animal food, since he imagines that it is entirely to be attributed to feeding on human flesh.

[3] We see very serious effects produced by the action of the sun in hot climates on diseased bodies, as in coup de soleil.

Molina, says in his History of Chili, that "it is but little known in the Spanish settlements, and still less so among the Indians. As the last have no word in their language expressive of it, there is every reason to presume that this malady was not known among them until after the arrival of the Spaniards. The rickets, a disease which for three centuries has been a scourge to Europe, is as yet unknown within the boundaries of Chili, and lame or deformed persons are very rarely to be met with." In the first missionary voyage to the South Sea Islands, we are told that "Until the Europeans visited the Otaheiteans, they had few disorders among them. Their temperate and regular mode of life, the great use of vegetables, little animal food, and absence of all noxious distilled spirits and wines, preserved them in health. *The case at present is wofully altered.*"

The facts are abundant which go to establish the belief of the progressive unhealthiness of mankind. None, however, is more striking than that certain disorders have begun to exist within the records of medical history, and that some important ones are only of three or four hundred years standing, and are still unknown in particular parts of the globe. Measles is a complaint of modern times; scarlatina still more recent, having made its first appearance only two centuries ago. The small-pox is of no very ancient date, since Hippocrates, Galen, and the other Greek physicians give it no place in their nosological histories, the first account of it being in the works of the Arabian physicians. We learn from Barrow's Travels, vol. i. p. 408, that to this day Southern Africa is wholly exempt from small-pox and from canine madness.

Dr. Thomas, in his book on cancer, p. 19, says, "There seems to me to exist an evident constitutional connexion between cancer and insanity." Galen has remarked that several of the scaly diseases of the skin originate from gout and rheumatism. I am myself acquainted with a gentleman who has been long afflicted with gout. During a violent attack, he was advised to immerse his legs in cold water. He did so, and the gout pains disappeared; but he was immediately seized with a paroxysm of asthma, which complaint he had never before experienced in his life. Difficulty of vision is sometimes relieved by other disorders; and every practitioner has witnessed in the common instances the alternation of diseases.

No writer mentions scurvy before Strabo, who tells us that it broke out for the first time in Augustus's reign, at which period we know how luxurious the Romans had become. Not long after, Seneca remarks in one of his epistles, that the Romans had acquired an ambling unsteady gait, from their high living and effeminacy. My intention is by no means to argue against refinement: on the contrary, my whole object and desire are, that men should combine the advantages of an adherence to the plain dictates of nature with those of cultivation and politeness. "For ye are the salt of the earth. But if the salt have lost its savor, wherewith shall it be salted?" At the same time I cannot but be persuaded, that the refinements of a healthy and elegant community would differ largely from those of a civilised unhealthy race. Surely, for instance, a sane and polished nation would never dream of overstrained discords in music, of the gothic in architecture, the picturesque in painting, or the grotesque in ornaments; among such a people these spurious qualities could have no consideration, because the grandeur of the sublime and the enchantment of the beautiful, whole and unimpaired, would supply all the gratifications which pure and unsophisticated minds could look for in the cultivation of the arts. At present even melancholy is made one of our luxuries. We court it to agitate our ill-tuned nerves, as is evident from the coloring of nine-tenths of the poetry and novels which are published.

Before objections are raised to the origin of all our complaints here laid down, let it be recollected that no medical writer has ever attempted to explain the cause of any one of the long catalogue of disorders to which we are liable. Hitherto they have been regarded as of mysterious original. Dr. Lambe has demonstrated by experiment the causes of all our complaints; thereby effecting in medicine what was long ago accomplished as to certain phenomena in natural philosophy. Thunder and lightning were considered for many ages in the same light that diseases have hitherto been, as awful visitations from above. In all such storms the Deity was believed to be personally present, and to wield the thunder-bolt with his "red right arm;" but science has at length shed her influence over mankind, and has consigned this creed to poetry and superstition.

The identity of disease is another consequence of the view which we are here taking of the general corruption of blood in the human species. It seems as absurd to imagine any disease local, as to believe that the light which now darts across this room is unsupported by a continuous stream of the same fluid. The mischief, whatever shape it assume, proceeds from the alimentary canal. Let us reflect on what takes place in insanity, for example: "The nature of the affections calculated to give birth to periodical mania, and the affinities of this complaint with melancholia and hypochondriasis, warrant the presumption that its seat, primarily, is almost always *in the epigastric region*, and that from this centre are propagated, as it were by a species of irradiation, the accessions of insanity. All the abdominal system even seem to enter into the sad confederacy. The patient complains of a sense of tightness in the region of the stomach, want of appetite, obstinate costiveness, and a sensation of heat in the bowels, which obtains a temporary relief from copious draughts of cooling liquors." p. 17.

"In the beginning of this complaint an unusual sensation is felt in the epigastric region, symptomatic, as it would appear, of some great commotion in the centre of the system; which, upon repetition, is felt to extend as far as the abdominal plexus, and to produce a spasmodic oppression of the præcordia, heat of the bowels, and costiveness."—PINEL ON INSANITY, p. 40.

The cause of our disorders, whatever it may be, appears regularly to distribute its effects from the stomach through every nerve and every fibre of the frame; and as this or that part happens to be a little more affected than the rest, and to become the channel by which the constitution throws off something that, if not expelled, would occasion death, the ostensible seat of disease is thus determined, and we accordingly give it a name. This seems to be the whole secret of the distinctive appellations by which we baptize our complaints. On what other ground can it be explained that Morgagni saw pus without the smallest ulceration in the urethra of a patient who had a gonorrhœa at the time of his decease; or that John Hunter, in dissecting a man who died when he had that complaint upon him, should have searched for ulcers and found them no where? Within my own recollection a person died at Oxford in a galloping consumption, without having her lungs at all ulcerated or inflamed; as her physician, to his great surprise, discovered on opening the body. Just as reasonably might it be contended that the smoke which issues from the chimney is independent of the fire below, as that diseases are local and specific.

When diseased matter has accumulated in the body to a certain degree, whether by our own government of ourselves, by the taint we have inherited from our ancestors, or, which is generally the case, from both these causes together, our teeth decay,[1] rheumatic and other pains and ailments ensue, and complaints are superadded until we are relieved by death, which, in our view of the subject, may be considered premature at eighty or a hundred years of age. From the premises which have been laid down, there follows a conclusion of great importance to our sickly species; viz. that where a certain degree of vigor yet remains in the constitution of the invalid (and how many are there who are invalids!) a total abandonment of the artificial exciting diet, or in other words, a strict perseverance in the use of such food as nature has clearly indicated to be proper for us by our anatomy, will enable the vital principle to make such efforts as shall finally succeed in expelling from the body, by indispositions gradually less and less violent, the morbific matter, or principle, which is working its destruction. But if disease shall have already made great and serious ravages within, if the invalid should have permitted too many precious hours to elapse unheeded, there is little hope to be entertained even from the adoption of Dr. Lambe's regimen: none, I fear, from any other quarter. Strong medicines may be resorted to, and momentary effects obtained; but nothing less than a miracle performed in his favor can save him. He is doomed, ere long, to be numbered in the tomb of his fathers.

---

[1] The perishing of the teeth is owing to the gums becoming charged with diseased matter, in consent with the general state of the body. The same tooth, which decays rapidly in the mouth, requires ages to destroy it when exposed on the earth to all the inclemencies of the weather.

On whatever side we turn, evidence presses upon us that it is the stomach and its appendages which are the cause and centre both of our well-being and of our infirmities. Through that important organ the race of men may be moulded, and modified, and rendered just what we please to make of them. What a peaceful and respectable existence was that of the ancient Brahmins! Sir William Temple, in his Essay on Learning, says of them, "Their moral philosophy consisted chiefly in preventing all diseases or distempers of the body, from which they esteemed the perturbation of mind in a great measure to arise: then in composing the mind, and exempting it from all anxious cares; esteeming the troublesome and solicitous thoughts about past and future to be like so many dreams, and no more to be regarded. They despised both life and death, pleasure and pain, or at least thought them perfectly indifferent. Their justice was exact and exemplary; their temperance so great, that they lived upon rice or herbs, *and upon nothing that had sensitive life*. If they fell sick, they counted it such a mark of intemperance, that they would frequently die out of shame and sullenness: *but many lived a hundred and fifty, and some two hundred years.*"

This description of an order of genuine philosophers or moralists is consoling to the mind, and furnishes such a contrast with what we generally see around us, that no one can doubt but that the cause of such a difference must indeed be a powerful one. So impressed am I while I read this passage from the works of Sir William Temple, that were it consistent with the dogmas of our holy religion, I should not hesitate to conclude that this said custom of flesh-eating is either that very principle of evil which we denominate "the devil," or something so parallel with it, that by getting rid of this awkward habit, we should in great measure banish his satanic majesty from the face of the earth; and indeed from the whole universe; since here alone, among the variety of inhabited globes, has the devil, all this time, been carrying on his hateful operations. This truth we learn from the first and second chapters of the book of Job. Whenever this horned personage makes his appearance in the presence of the Almighty, and the Lord says to him, "Whence comest thou?" his constant and simple answer is, "From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it."

I will now say a few words of the state of the invalid, who would, I believe, eagerly relinquish his erroneous diet, if he could look into his frame and observe the ravages which disease is making there. Rather than contemplate their real source, rather than think of foregoing his accustomed indulgences, the unhealthy man is for ever attributing his sufferings to slight and inadequate causes. He cases himself in fleecy hosiery; he lists his double doors at top and bottom; he lays cushions on his window sashes, and at length injures himself by excluding too carefully the external air from his apartment. His selfishness is ever increasing upon him; his temper does not improve; and there is no limit to his whims and caprices. An Englishman once told me at Rome that he had been brought into that delightful climate[1] by an impending consumption, of which the symptoms were unequivocal; and that the cause of his illness had been very clearly and ingeniously explained to him by his physician in London to be his habit of wearing cotton shirts, the minute particles of which made their way into the pores of his skin and entirely obstructed his perspiration. I will take occasion here to mention that the companion of that gentleman and myself, in our rides through the environs of Rome in the year 1794, was Dr. Adam Ferguson, the historian of the Roman republic, who, at that time in his old age, was living strictly on a vegetable regimen. He returned to Scotland from Italy, after having accomplished what he told me had long been uppermost in his thoughts and wishes, this visit to the capitol; and is still alive, being Professor of Mathematics in the University of Edinburgh. The reason why the vegetable diet is not successful in all instances, and therefore not more generally adopted, seems to be that its beneficial effects have been in great measure counteracted by the impurity of water. It fell to the fortune of Dr. Lambe to discover, by the force of his own reflections, this important fact. Fruits and vegetables, even with the use of common water, would probably prolong life more than animal food; yet, as acute and chronic diseases would still supervene, the benefits derived from the antiphlogistic regimen could neither be sufficient, nor sufficiently manifest, to produce a conviction of its salutury tendency.

---

[1] It will not be denied that in Italy, where fruits and vegetables rot unused in the streets, a family with two or three acres of garden around them could scarcely have any real occasion for the use of fire or water; and yet, so far from natural were the habits of the Romans, that every one knows the legal sentence of exile was by them denominated *Aquæ et ignis interdictio*, under a persuasion that fire and water were so indispensable to existence, that those persons whom the operation of the law deprived of their use, must necessarily abandon their country, or perish.

Let us again consider a little what is the general state of mankind in respect of intellect. Locke, who thought deeply on the understanding, regards a large portion of mankind as on the brink of insanity; and what he has said is so remarkable, and I believe so just, that I shall beg leave to extract his opinion at some length in the appendix to this volume. I have often met with people, and I dare say the reader has, who were incapable of pointing out the way with any distinctness, to a distant part of this town, though they had often traversed the road; and others whose memory is in so unsettled a state, that when they ring a bell, they require time to recollect their intended order when the servant makes his appearance. Even where these extremes do not exist, there is frequently something so strange and anomalous in the minds of men, that one is wholly at a loss to account for what one sees. The other day I inclined my ear with increased attention towards a person who observed of another that had left the room, "he is a weak man, but a person of considerable ability." I was reduced to ask an explanation, when I found the import of the phrase to be, that our departed companion was a man of talents, of considerable facility in the acquisition of languages and other accomplishments, but of very little common sense or judgment. Though we are not prepared to say, perhaps, with Cabanis, the French physician, that all genius is disease; yet the condition of mind above described is assuredly of that character; and there are many circumstances and indications which lead to a suspicion that extraordinary abilities of every sort are, in the present state of mankind, *the result of the principle of vitality struggling against the progress of diseased action.* One of our faculties, indeed, the imagination, seems not to have been impaired by our irregularities; although even that power, after a certain point of civilisation and luxurious living, loses in substance what it gains in extension.

The subject which we are upon is abstruse and difficult. I acknowledge myself unworthy to treat it: and after all that abler heads could say, the entire effects of a long-continued unnatural diet on the human mind must be committed to future developement and investigation. That there will be some difficulties for the naturalist to encounter, the following fact may attest:—In those who are proceeding towards an apoplectic death, the vestiges of the disease may be traced by a careful observer ten or twelve years antecedent to the catastrophe. The increasing stimulus on the brain renders such patients more quick and shrewd than otherwise they would appear; which cleverness, however, must not be confounded nor put into comparison with that more solid judgment and improved memory which would, in all probability, attend on a steady compliance with the dictates of nature. What is known of the imperfect but more vigorous health of savages may lead to a supposition, that in a really sound and uncorrupted state, the operations of our sight at least and hearing would be much more intense, and our sensual enjoyments more lively than they are at present: that likewise, there would be more spirit in our countenances, more emphasis in our tones, more energy in our actions.

Contrast this our condition with that of men and women in all the health which, though it has not perhaps been witnessed, may still be imagined. The male broad-shouldered, dignified, erect; his muscles every where strongly pronounced; his sinewy form gradually lessening from the shoulders to the feet; in every limb, vigor and elasticity. The woman more than beautiful; her eyes sparkling with mirth, or brimming with sweetness; happy in her own existence, and increasing the happiness of all around her. Not Venus, first dripping from the ocean, could have been purer or more lovely than such a female.

Before I conclude, I will beg leave to recapitulate what has been said, or implied, in this treatise.

It appears, then, that diseased actions become suspended by the adoption of the regimen discovered by Dr. Lambe: that although paroxysms of disease may be renewed from internal changes which are constantly taking place in the body, they decline in severity, and gradually wear out; but that from the trials hitherto made, two years at least are necessary to produce a radical effect on the constitution; though great relief is sometimes obtained immediately, and sometimes after the expiration of a few months. That if in certain persons a considerable paleness and shrinking of the features are occasioned by this mode of living, it is not essential to it, as young children who are so brought up have a fine color in the second year, and enjoy perfect health and strength. That where such consequence ensues, it need not excite apprehension, since the reason of it is, that by persevering in this temperate diet the determination of blood to the head is prevented. That moreever, to give hopes of great success from this treatment, the patients should not be very old, nor the radical strength much impaired; for in confirmed consumption, frequently in the ulcerated cancer, and in general, wherever the constitution is exhausted, the benefit, as we see in Dr. Lambe's Reports of Cases, has been only palliative and transitory.

The author considers that there are many little irregularities, or deviations from health (some of them indeed more important) which pass unobserved because they are so common, but which ought to be registered under the head of diseased symptoms. Such are stuttering, frequent yawning and sneezing, great sensibility to partial air: teething sickness, nausea in child-bearing; extraordinary watchfulness, disturbed dreams, starting, talking, or walking in the sleep; eyes or eye-lids charged and suffused; near-sightedness, or any other defect[1] of the senses; blackness on the edges of the teeth from the tartar transmitted from the stomach; unwholesome, obscure appearance of the skin, which yields not to the application of soap and water: absence of mind, laziness, precipitation of manner; incorrigible fixedness in these habits; illiberal feelings; quarrelsome inclinations; thirst of power; inflamed eagerness to have one's way even in points of little consequence;[2] asperity and hardness of character. To these I will add shyness, which in its advanced stage is the beginning of insanity; those who are going out of their senses being often so shy as to hold their hands before their faces when any one comes into their room.

By this regimen the stamina are much improved in infancy; they are altered in persons of a middle age; and in old men the actions of the system are beneficially changed, although no effect is produced on the stamina. The power of running farther than the invalid formerly could do without being out of breath, may be considered as a test of improving health. It is true that in the common way of living, people do resist attacks of sickness, and life is in some instances much protracted. So long indeed as the vitality of the frame is not extinguishing (if I may use that verb in a neutral sense) the patient will be destroyed neither by acute illnesses, nor by the medical treatment of them. But let us not be deceived by flattering and fallacious circumstances. When we recollect the number of acquaintances and of men prominent in the society where we are born, who, though many of them were not greatly advanced in the career of life, are already removed from the busy scene and crumbling in the dust, it will not be contended that death does not deal his weapon around him with sufficient activity. Such an opinion at least will not be maintained by those parents who have smarted under the loss of a dear and engaging child; and who dread the recurrence of such anguish more than the threatened punishment of a future world, or more even than the tortures which those who have feeling are doomed to endure from the austere and intolerant. The pale husband too, who had carried into retirement something which the world still desired to recover, some mild and gracious woman whom it was his pride there to serve in secret, his only hope, under heaven, to constitute her happiness—he will give an eager testimony to the devastations occasioned by the merciless leveller of mankind. Recently has he lost his best companion; the spotless mother of his children; her who was the repository of his cares and his secrets; who at each return to his threshold found no words but kind ones for him. Has she then suddenly disappeared, who so late was the cheerful and affectionate centre around which the whole family revolved; and who has left the question for ever undecided whether she contributed more largely to the comfort and pleasure of the father, or of the children? Heaven! what a space, which can never again be completely filled, has death occasioned here! To prevent the recurrence of such ills and bitternesses, all that I petition for is a fair experiment of Dr. Lambe's system. I think I may confidently answer for the result.

---

[1] Considering what are the disgusting offices which ill health entails upon servants, the attendants of the sick, it seems a merciful dispensation in their behalf that the sense of smelling should be universally deficient in them. It may be imagined how baneful a vapor is imparted to the atmosphere by consumptive patients, when we learn that the milk and butter of a cow confined in the bed-chamber of a person in the last stage of consumption cannot be used, so disagreeable is their flavor.

[2] So deeply disordered are many people, that their lightest wish kindles quickly into an appetite; and some individuals are so harsh and obdurate in their dispositions, that kind words, often repeated, make no impression upon them; but, let a spark of anger, or of resentment, arise in their bosoms, it rushes into a flame, and hurries them on to do perhaps the very action to which the most friendly solicitations were unavailing to engage them. These tempers are volcanoes ever on the point of bursting forth. Nor is this the whole of the evil. One never can be entirely secure of those who appear better disposed; for people undergo such mental changes in the lapse of a few years, that now and then one is at a loss to recognize one's old acquaintances. In physiological discussions, the moral and intellectual faculties should never be disjoined from the physical and organic; and according to the principles reasoned upon in this publication, it may be laid down as a medical maxim, that the abovementioned perverse state of mind is an unerring symptom of much latent mischief in the stamina.

It is much to be desired that this regimen for effecting the gradual efflux of morbific matter from the human system should become general, and produce the effects which have been anticipated, since it appears to be the only hope left for mankind, on this side of the grave, to which so many thousands look for relief from their griefs and their sufferings. If moral instruction in every possible form, if the doctrines of the purest philosophy could have rendered men virtuous and happy, how many ages would have elapsed since these qualities had been universal. On no shelf in any library can we cast our eyes without reflecting, to no sermon from any pulpit can we bend our attention without feeling, that if we did but regulate our conduct by half the excellent precepts there inculcated, as little occasion would there be for restrictive laws as for an alterative regimen. But unfortunately, man has quitted his instincts without sufficiently cultivating his reason; and the consequence is, that such a scene is continually exhibited on this globe as to lead one to inquire whether it is destined to be eternally the place of amusement, the play-house of our planetary system.[1] But I am too anxious not to stray out of my limited province of merely stating the success of a dietetic experiment in my own family, to pursue this subject farther.

CONCLUSION.

As to the plan of this volume, which may as well perhaps be spoken of here as any where else, the author, after briefly stating his subject, has endeavoured to reconcile the ordinances of the scriptures respecting food with the dietetic doctrines prevalent in this essay; and likewise those ancient fables which he believes to have an allusion to the early condition of mankind, as connected with the subject in question. He shows in the next place that arguments may be brought from the science of comparative anatomy in favor of a general vegetable diet among men; especially, from the distinction of the colon in the herbivorous and carnivorous tribes; there being no exception to the rule of herbivorous animals having the colon cellulated, but where an increase of the digestive process is provided for earlier in the alimentary canal, as, for example, by the four stomachs of the sheep and cow. That the diminution of vigor and curtailment of life suffered by man are partaken by the animals[2] which he has domesticated, and also that the unfavorable opinion of a flesh diet here inculcated, derives support from certain passages in the works of several highly estimated writers. The author then proceeds to cite authorities on one of the two leading branches of his subject, the poison of common water; and after deploring the fallen state of the faculties of memory and judgment, he relates the particulars of an experiment of the vegetable regimen instituted in his own family. He next states the evidence against a meat diet, attempts a reply to several of the objections usually made to Dr. Lambe's principles, and ventures finally to touch upon some consequences connected with the theory of contagion, which he conceives to follow from those principles.

---

[1] So long as men are compassionate to such a degree that they cannot hear a fly struggling in a spider's web without emotion, it never can be reasonably maintained that it is their natural impulse to wound and kill the dumb animals, or to butcher one another in what is called *the field of honor*.

[2] In remarking upon the inferior animals, it might have been stated, that like man, they lose, when domesticated, many instincts. The horse which is caught in the forests of Hungary and confined in a stable, preserves the instinct of bleeding himself by opening a vein in his side, or on the forehand, with his teeth, whenever he is overheated by long journeys.

He will now close this first part of the book with a caution to him who may become a convert to this simple method of preventing disease, not to lose his temper when assailed in argument by his tenacious opponents with violence almost inexplicable; and to be firm and constant in his own practice, in contempt of all the means which will be resorted to, whether threats or persuasions, to turn him aside from his offensive purpose; remembering, if he aspire to the privileges of a freeman, what were the ancient conditions of that claim, and what the oracular language in which they were pronounced—

Quisnam igitur liber? sapiens, sibi qui imperiosus.

APPENDIX.

Mr. Locke felt that there was something wrong in the intellectual state of mankind. In his Essay on Human Understanding, book ii. ch. 33, he says, "There is scarce any one that does not observe something that seems odd to him, and is in itself really extravagant in the opinions, reasonings, and actions of other men. The least flaw of this kind, if at all different from his own, every one is quick-sighted enough to espy in another, and will by the authority of reason forwardly condemn, though he be guilty of much greater unreasonableness in his own tenets and conduct, which he never perceives, and will very hardly, if at all, be convinced of.

"This proceeds not wholly from self-love, though that has often a great hand in it. Men of fair minds, and not given up to the overweening of self-flattery, are frequently guilty of it; and in many cases one with amazement hears the arguings, and is astonished at the obstinacy of a worthy man, who yields not to the evidence of reason, though laid before him as clear as day-light.

"This sort of unreasonableness is usually imputed to education and prejudice, and for the most part truly enough, though that reaches not the bottom of the disease, nor shows distinctly enough whence it rises, or wherein it lies. Education is often rightly assigned for the cause, and prejudice is a good general name for the thing itself: but yet, I think he ought to look a little farther, who would trace this sort of madness to the root it springs from; and so explain it as to show whence this flaw has its original in very sober and rational minds, and wherein it consists.

"I shall be pardoned for calling it by so harsh a name as madness, when it is considered that opposition to reason deserves that name, and is really madness; and there is scarce a man so free from it, but that if he should always, on all occasions, argue or do as in some cases he constantly does, would not be thought fitter for Bedlam than civil conversation. I do not here mean when he is under the power of an unruly passion, but in the steady calm course of his life."

Mr. Locke, not having discovered the physical source of this disease, as he calls it, ascribes it to a wrong association of ideas, which is only another effect of the same cause.

A

HISTORY

OF

THE PENAL LAWS

AGAINST THE

IRISH CATHOLICS;

FROM THE TREATY OF LIMERICK TO THE UNION.

WITH AN INDEX.

By SIR HENRY PARNELL, BART. M. P.

[*Continued from No. XXXIX.*]

NEW EDITION, CORRECTED FOR THE PAMPHLETEER
EXCLUSIVELY.

LONDON:

1822.

A
HISTORY
OF THE
PENAL LAWS,
&c.

THOUGH the treaty of Limerick was now violated in every point, the spirit of persecution was still restless and unsatisfied. However great was the ingenuity of the legislators who produced that master-piece of oppression, the act to prevent the farther growth of Popery, it was found that another act was still wanting to explain and amend it. Such an act passed in the year 1709.[1]

The 1st clause provides, that no Papists shall be capable of taking any annuity for life.

The following is the 3d clause, every word of which is of value, in order to show the vexations with which the unfortunate Catholics of Ireland have been exposed: "And, be it further enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that where and as often as any child or children of any Popish parent or parents hath, or have heretofore professed or conformed him, her, or themselves, to the Protestant religion, as by law established, and enrolled in the High Court of Chancery, a certificate of the Bishop of the diocese in which he, she, or they shall inhabit or reside, testifying his, her, or their being a Protestant, and conforming him, her, or themselves, to the church of Ireland, as by law established, *it shall and may be lawful for the High Court of Chancery, upon a bill founded upon this act, to oblige the said Papist parent, or parents, to discover upon oath the full value of all his, her, or their estate, as well personal as real,* clear, over and above all real incumbrances and debts contracted, bonâ fide, for valuable consideration, before the enrolment of such certificate, and thereupon to make such *order for the support and maintenance* of such Protestant child or children, by the distribution of the said real and personal estate, to and among such Protestant child or children, for the present support of such Protestant child or children; and also to and for the portion or portions, and future maintenance or maintenances, of such Protestant child, or children, after the decease of such Popish parent or parents, as the said court shall judge fit."

---

[1] 8th Anne, c. 3.

The 12th clause provides, that all converts in public employments, members of parliament, barristers, attorneys, or officers of any courts of law, shall educate their children Protestants.

By the 14th clause, the Popish wife of a Papist, having power to make a jointure, conforming, shall, if she survives her husband, have such provision, not exceeding the power of her husband, to make a jointure, as the Chancellor shall adjudge.

By the 15th clause, the Popish wife of a Papist, not being otherwise provided for, conforming, shall have a proportion out of his chattels, notwithstanding any will or voluntary disposition, and the stat. 7th W. III. 6.

The 16th clause provides, that a Papist teaching school publicly, or in a private house, or as usher to a Protestant, shall be deemed and prosecuted as a Popish regular convict.

The 18th clause provides, that Popish priests, who shall be converted, shall receive 30*l.* per annum, to be levied and paid by Grand Juries.

The 20th clause provides, whimsically enough, for the reward of discovering Popish clergy and schoolmasters, viz.

For discovering an archbishop, bishop, vicar-general, or other person exercising any foreign ecclesiastical jurisdiction - - - - - - - - - -	£50 0 0
For discovering each regular clergyman, and each secular clergyman, not registered - - - - -	£20 0 0
For discovering each Popish schoolmaster or usher -	£10 0 0

The 21st clause empowers two Justices to summon any Papist of 18 years of age, and if he shall refuse to give testimony where and when he heard mass celebrated, and who and what persons were present at the celebration of it, and likewise touching the residence and abode of any priest or Popish schoolmaster to commit him to jail, without bail, for 12 months, or until he shall pay 20*l.*

By the 25th clause, no priest can officiate except in the parish for which he is registered, by 2d Anne, c. 7.

The 30th clause provides for the discovery of all trusts agreed to be undertaken in favor of Papists; and enables any Protestant to file a bill in Chancery against any person concerned in any sale, lease, mortgage, or incumbrance, in trust for Papists, and to compel him to discover the same; and it further provides, that all issues to be tried in any action founded upon this act, shall be tried by none but known Protestants.

The 37th clause provides, that no Papist in trade, except in the linen trade, shall take more than two apprentices.

The following are the other acts passed in this reign concerning the Catholics.—

An act to prevent Popish clergy from coming into the kingdom.[1]

An act for registering Popish clergy. By which all the Catholic clergy then in the kingdom were required to give in their names and places of abode at the next quarter sessions: by this act they are prohibited from employing curates.[2]

An act to amend this act.[3]

An act to explain and amend an act to prevent Papists being solicitors or sheriffs, &c.[4]

Clauses are introduced into this act, by which Catholics are prevented from serving on Grand Juries; and by which, in trials upon any statute for strengthening the Protestant interest, the plaintiff might challenge a Papist, which challenge the judge was to allow.

During all Queen Anne's reign, the inferior civil officers, by order of Government, were incessantly harassing the Catholics, with oaths, imprisonments, and forfeitures, without any visible cause but hatred of their religious profession. In the year 1708, on the bare rumor of an intended invasion of Scotland by the Pretender, forty-one Roman Catholic noblemen and gentlemen were imprisoned in the castle of Dublin; and, when they were afterwards set at liberty, the Government was so sensible of the wrong done to them, that it remitted their fees, amounting to 800*l.* A custom that had existed from time immemorial, for infirm men, women, and children, to make a pilgrimage every summer to a place called St. John's well, in the county of Meath, in hopes of obtaining relief from their several disorders, by performing at it certain acts of penance and devotion, was deemed an object worthy of the serious consideration of the House of Commons; who accordingly passed a vote, that these sickly devotees "were assembled in that place to the great hazard and danger of the public peace, and safety of the kingdom." They also passed a vote, on the 17th March, 1705, "That all magistrates and other persons whatsoever, who neglected or omitted to put them (the penal laws) in due execution, were betrayers of the liberties of the kingdom;"[1] and in June, 1705, they resolved, "That the saying and hearing of mass, by persons who had not taken the oath of abjuration, tended to advance the interest of the Pretender; and that such judges and magistrates as wilfully neglected to make diligent inquiry into, and to discover such wicked practices, ought to be looked upon as enemies to her Majesty's Government."[2] And, upon another occasion, they resolved, "That the prosecuting and informing against Papists was an honorable service to the Government."[3]

---

[1] 2d Anne, c. 3. [2] 2d Anne, c. 7. [3] 4th Anne, c. 2.

[4] 6th Anne, c. 1. See also 6 Anne, c. 16. §. 6. and 8 Anne, c. 3. §. 26. concerning Priests marrying Protestants.

GEORGE I.

The following acts of Parliament were passed in this reign, for the purpose of strengthening the system which had been adopted by William and Anne, for preventing the growth of Popery.

An act to make the militia of this kingdom more useful.[4]

By the 11th and 12th clauses of this act, the horses of Papists may be seized for the militia.

By the 4th and 18th clauses, Papists are to pay double towards raising the militia.

By the 16th clause, Popish house-keepers in a city, are to find fit Protestant substitutes.

An act to restrain Papists from being high or petty constables, and for the better regulating the parish watches.[5]

An act for the more effectual preventing fraudulent conveyances, in order to multiply votes for electing members to serve in Parliament, &c.[6]

By the 7th clause of this act, no Papist can vote at an election, unless he takes the oaths of allegiance and *abjuration.*

An act for the better regulating the town of Galway, and for strengthening the Protestant interest therein.[7]

An act for the better regulating the corporation of the city of Kilkenny, and strengthening the Protestant interest therein.[8]

An act by which Papists resident in towns, who shall not provide a Protestant watchman to watch in their room, shall be subject to certain penalties.[9]

By the 12th Geo. I. c. 9. §. 7. No Papist can vote at any vestry held for the purpose of levying or assessing money for rebuilding and repairing parish churches.

---

[1] Com. Jour. 3. 289. [2] Ib. 319. [3] Ib. 319. [4] 2d G. I. c. 9.

[5] 2d G. I. c. 10.—This act expired in three years, and was not renewed.

[6] 2d Geo. I. c. 19. [7] 4th Geo. I c. 15. [8] 4th Geo. I. c. 16.

[9] 6th Geo. I. c. 10.

These acts of Parliament originated in the same spirit of persecution, which disgraced the reigns of William and Anne, and were, like the penal laws against the Catholics of those reigns, palpable violations of the treaty of Limerick. Though a glimmering of toleration had found its way into the councils of England, and given rise to "*an act for exempting Protestant dissenters of this Country (Ireland) from certain penalties to which they were subject,*" the Catholics were excluded, by a particular clause, from any benefit of it. And though it was in this reign that the first act[1] passed "*for discharging all persons in offices and employments from all penalties which they had incurred by not qualifying themselves, pursuant to an act to prevent the further growth of Popery,*" the favor conferred by it was wholly to the Protestant dissenters, as no Catholic had been placed in any public office since the passing of that penal law.

The loyalty of the Catholics was in this reign put to a complete trial, by the Scotch rebellion of 1715. If, after having fought three campaigns in support of James's pretensions to the throne of Ireland; after having experienced the infraction of every part of the treaty of Limerick, and been exposed to a code of statutes, by which they were totally excluded from the privileges of the constitution; and if, after they had become subject "to the worst of all oppressions, the persecution of private society and private manners,"[2] they had embarked in the cause of the invader, their conduct would have been that of a high spirited nation, goaded into a state of desperation by their relentless tormentors, and if their resistance had been successful, their leaders would have ranked among the Tells and Washingtons of modern history.—But so far from yielding to the natural dictates of revenge, or attempting to take advantage of what was passing in Scotland to regain their rights, they did not follow the example of their rulers, in violating, upon the first favorable opportunity, a sacred and solemn compact; and thus they gave the strongest testimony, that they had wholly given up their former hopes of establishing a Catholic prince upon the throne. Their loyalty was not, however, a protection to them against the oppressions of their Protestant countrymen. The penalties for the exercise of their religion, were generally and rigidly inflicted. Their chapels were shut up, their priests dragged from their hiding-places, hurried into prisons, and from thence sent into banishment.

[1] 6th Geo. I. c. 9.

[2] Burke's Letter to a Peer of Ireland.

GEORGE II.

In this reign, the following additional disabilities were imposed upon the Catholics. —

By the 1st G. II. c. 9. sect. 7. no Papist can vote at an election without taking the oath of supremacy. However great the oppression which the Catholics had experienced during former reigns, this measure altogether completed their entire exclusion from the benefits of the Constitution, and from the opportunity of regaining their former just rights. It was because this privilege had begun to operate amongst Protestants in a manner very favorable to the Catholics, and to bring about a feeling of regret for their sufferings, and a coalition between the two parties to oppose the influence of the English Government as a common cause of grievances, that Primate Boulter advised the Ministers to pass this law. His principle of government for Ireland, was to uphold the English interest by the divisions of the inhabitants; and, on this occasion, it induced him to adopt the desperate resolution of disfranchising, at one stroke, above five-sixths of its population.[1]

By the first clause of 1st Geo. II. c. 30. barristers, six clerks, &c. are required to take the oath of supremacy.

By the second clause all converts, &c. are bound to educate their children as Protestants.

By 7th Geo. II. c. 5. sect. 12. barristers or solicitors, marrying Papists, are deemed Papists, and made subject to all penalties as such.

By 7th Geo. II. c. 6. no convert can act as a justice of the peace, whose wife, or children, under 16 years of age, are educated Papists.

The 13th Geo. II. c. 6. is an act to amend former acts for disarming Papists.

By the 6th clause of this act, Protestants educating their children as Papists, are made subject to the same disabilities as Papists are.

By 9th Geo. II. c. 3. no person can serve on a petty jury, unless seized of a freehold of 5*l.* per annum, or, being a Protestant, unless possessed of a profit rent of 15*l.* per annum under a lease for years.

By 9th Geo. II. c. 6. sect. 5. persons robbed by privateers, during war with a Popish prince, shall be reimbursed by grand jury presentment, and the money be levied upon the goods and lands of Popish inhabitants only.

---

[1] Primate Boulter, in his Letter of this year to the Archbishop of Canterbury (1st. vol. p. 210.) says, "There are, probably, in this kingdom, five Papists, at least, to one Protestant."

The 19th Geo. II. c. 5. is an act for granting a duty on hawkers and pedlars to the society of Protestant charter-schools.[1]

The 19th Geo. II. c. 13. is an act to annul all marriages between Protestants and Papists, or celebrated by Popish priests.[2]

By the 23rd Geo. II. c. 10. sect. 3. every Popish priest who shall celebrate any marriage contrary to 12th Geo. I. c. 3. and be thereof convicted, shall be hanged.

Of these last acts, and of Lord Chesterfield's administration, Mr. Burke gives the following account—"This man, while he was duping the credulity of the Papists with fine words in private, and commending their good behaviour during a rebellion in Great Britain, as it well deserved to be commended and rewarded, was capable of urging penal laws against them in a speech from the throne,[3] and of stimulating with provocatives the wearied and half exhausted bigotry of the Parliament of Ireland. They set to work, but they were at a loss what to do; for they had already almost gone through every contrivance which could waste the vigor of their country: but, after much struggle, they produced a child of their old age, the shocking and unnatural act about marriages, which tended to finish the scheme for making the people not only two distinct parties for ever, but keeping them as two distinct species in the same land. Mr. Gardiner's humanity was shocked at it, as one of the worst parts of that truly barbarous system, if one could well settle the preference, where almost all the parts were outrages on the rights of humanity and the laws of nations."[1]

---

[1] The following is the preamble of the charter for erecting these schools. "George II. by the grace of God, &c. Forasmuch as we have received information, by the petition of the lord primate, lord chancellor, archbishops, noblemen, bishops, judges, gentry, and clergy, of our kingdom of Ireland, that in many parts of the said kingdom, there are great tracts of land almost entirely inhabited by Papists, who are kept by their clergy in great ignorance of the true religion, and bred up in great dissatisfaction to the Government. That the erecting of English Protestant schools in those places, *is absolutely necessary for their conversion;* that the English parish schools already established, are not *sufficient for that purpose;* nor can the residence of the parochial clergy only fully answer that end."—Catholics are excluded by this charter from being subscribers to, or members of this society. *Vid. Report of Committee of Irish H. of Commons,* 14 *Ap.* 1788. *Ir. Comm. Journ.* 12 *Ap.* 810.

The children admitted into the schools are orphans, or the children of Catholic and other poor natives of Ireland, who, from their situation in life, are not likely to educate them as Protestants. They are apprenticed at the age of fourteen years, with a fee of seven guineas with each female, and of five guineas with each male, into Protestant families. The society give a portion of five pounds to every person educated in these schools, upon his or her marrying a Protestant.

In Sept. 1806, the number of children in the schools were 2130.

The funds of the society consist in lands, funded property, and an annual grant of Parliament.—They amount to about 34,000*l.* per annum. From the year 1754, 31 Geo. II. c. 1. to the 1st January, 1808, there has been granted by Parliament to this society 491,326*l.* besides certain duties on hawkers and pedlars, from 1754 to 1786.

By the 23rd G. II. c. 11. the society may appoint persons to take up beggar children, and send them to the charter schools, and when old enough bind them apprentices.

By the same act, §. 8. a child received with the parent's consent, is deemed a child of the public, and may be disposed of though claimed by the parent.

[2] The first act on this head is 6 Anne, c. 16. 1, &c. 8 Anne, c. 3. Sect. 26.

[3] "The measures that have hitherto been taken to prevent the growth of Popery, have, I hope, had some, and will still have a greater effect; however I leave it to your consideration whether nothing further can be done, either by new laws, or by more effectual execution of those in being, to secure the nation

Of the conduct of the Catholics during the Scotch rebellion of 1745, fortunately for them, but greatly to the shame of those who accuse them of being actuated by religious principles inconsistent with their duty to their sovereign, there is on record an irrefutable document. In the year 1762, upon a debate in the House of Lords, about the expediency of raising five regiments of Catholics for the King of Portugal, the Primate, Dr. Stone, in answer to the usual objections that were urged on all occasions against the good faith and loyalty of that body, declared in his place, "that in the year 1747, after that rebellion was entirely suppressed, happening to be in England, he had an opportunity of perusing all the papers of the rebels, and their correspondents, which were seized in the custody of Murray, the Pretender's secretary; and that, after having spent much time, and taken great pains in examining them, not without some share of the then common suspicion, that there might be some private understanding and intercourse between them and the Irish Catholics, he could not discover the least trace, hint, or intimation of such intercourse or correspondence in them, or of any of the latter's favoring or abetting, or having been so much as made acquainted with the designs or proceedings of these rebels. And what," he said, "he wondered at most of all was, that in all his researches, he had not met with any passage in any of these papers, from which he could infer, that either their holy father, the pope, or any of his cardinals, bishops, or other dignitaries of that church, or any of the Irish clergy, had either directly, or indirectly, encouraged, aided, or approved of the commencing or carrying on of that rebellion."[2]

---

against the greater number of Papists, whose speculative errors would only deserve pity if their pernicious influence upon civil society did not both require and authorise restraint."—*Speech to both Houses of Parliament, October 8, 1745.*—Com. Jour. 7. 642.

[1] Letter to a Peer in Ireland.

[2] Curry, Rev. of the civil wars of Ireland, 2. 261.

Those of the clergy of England, who lately took so active a part in exciting and upholding the infamous outcry of "No Popery"— will do well to compare this declaration of Primate Stone, with the following statement of the conduct of the Irish clergy, immediately upon the breaking out of the Scotch rebellion. They will learn how easily it is, even for the grave profession of the church to commit errors, and to pollute its sacred character, by embarking in the controversy of party politics. "The bishops wrote pastoral letters to their respective diocesans, to excite the members of the established church to enforce all the penal statutes, and with equal wisdom and charity, and a ready obedience did the clergy follow the example and directions of their superiors, and apply the whole power of their body to support the fanatic politics of the day. In their inflammatory sermons they excited religious animosity by reviving the most shocking circumstances of the Irish rebellion of 1641, and of the gun-powder plot in England in 1605. These transactions were studiously aggravated, and the crimes, whether real or supposed, committed by Catholics, dead more than a century before, were imputed to all those who survived of the same religious persuasion."[1]

If the conduct of the bishops and clergy was improper, on account of its inconsistency with those principles of universal charity, that the gospel inculcated, it was still more so, from there being no grounds even of suspicion, that the Catholics were disloyal. Besides, it was indecent in the last degree for those, who were endowed by the state for the purpose only of discharging the functions of a religious profession, to degrade their sacred character by assuming the duties of the civil magistrates, and embarking in all the tumult and passion of political persecution. The conduct of the Catholic priests at this period forms a contrast, by no means creditable to those who teach the superior tolerance of the Protestant religion, and ground their animosities against the Catholics on the supposed illiberality which controls their principles. This oppressed and indigent body of men, instead of taking offence at the proceedings of the bishops and clergy of the established church, "co-operated with their Protestant brethren, to maintain order and tranquillity. Their pastoral letters, public discourses from the pulpit, and private admonitions, were equally directed for the service of the Government."[2] Yet these clergy were the members of that church, the principles of which are stated to be of such a nature by many of the English clergy, as to render it absolutely impossible, that a Catholic can be a good subject.

[1] Curry Rev. 2. 259.

[2] Chesterfield's Works, 1. 150. Ir. Ed.

On the 26th September, 1757, the Duke of Bedford was sworn in Lord Lieutenant. His open declarations of liberal sentiments towards the Catholics, and some communications that were made for the first time since the passing of the ferocious act of Anne to prevent the growth of Popery, of an intention to repeal some part of the penal laws, encouraged them to hope for a change in the system of Irish government. Ten days after his arrival, the Catholic clergy of Dublin, influenced by these communications, read the following exhortation to their respective congregations. It forms the first and a very important document in proof of the sufferings, the resignation, and the loyalty of the Catholic body. It is one peculiarly deserving of attention, as being well calculated to remove the ignorance and prejudices of those who still persist in calumniating the Catholic clergy of Ireland, and representing them as enemies to the King and Constitution.

Exhortation of the Roman Catholic Clergy of Dublin, read from their Altars on the 2d of October, 1757.

It is now time, Christians, that you return your most grateful thanks to the Almighty God, who, after visiting you with a scarcity, which approached near unto a famine, has been graciously pleased, like a merciful father, to hear your prayers, and feed you with a plentiful harvest; nor ought you to forget those kind benefactors, who, in the severest times, mindful only of the public good, generously bestowed, without any distinction of persons, those large charities, by which thousands were preserved, who otherwise must have perished the victims of hunger and poverty. We ought especially to be most earnest in our thanks to the chief governors and magistrates of the kingdom, and of this city in particular, who, on this occasion, proved the fathers and saviours of the nation. But as we have not a more effectual method of showing our acknowledgment to our temporal governors, than by an humble, peaceful, and obedient behaviour; as hitherto, we earnestly exhort you to continue in the same happy and Christian disposition, and thus, by degrees, you will entirely efface in their minds those evil impressions, which have been conceived so much to our prejudice, and industriously propagated by our enemies. A series of more than sixty years spent, with a pious resignation, under the hardships of very severe penal laws, and with the greatest thankfulness for the lenity and moderation, with which they were executed, ever since the accession of the present royal family, is certainly a fact which must outweigh, in the minds of all unbiassed persons, any misconceived opinions of the doctrines and tenets of our holy church.

You know that it has always been our constant practice, as ministers of Jesus Christ, to inspire you with the greatest horror for thefts, frauds, murders, and the like abominable crimes; as being contrary to the laws of God and nature, destructive of civil society, condemned by our most holy church, which, so far from justifying them on the score of religion, or any other pretext whatsoever, delivers the unrepenting authors of such criminal practices over to Satan.

We are no less zealous than ever in exhorting you to abstain from cursing, swearing, and blaspheming; detestable vices, to which the poorer sort of our people are most unhappily addicted, and which must, at one time or other, bring down the vengeance of heaven upon you in some visible punishment, unless you absolutely refrain from them.

It is probable, that from hence some people have taken occasion to brand us with this infamous calumny, that we need not fear to take false oaths, and consequently to perjure ourselves; as if we believed that any power upon earth could authorise such damnable practices, or grant dispensations for this purpose. How unjust and cruel this charge is, you know by our instructions to you both in public and private, in which we have ever condemned such doctrines as false and impious. Others, likewise, may easily know it from the constant behaviour of numbers of Roman Catholics, who have given the strongest proofs of their abhorrence of those tenets, by refusing to take oaths, which, however conducive to their temporal interest, appeared to them entirely repugnant to the principles of their religion.

We must now intreat you, dear Christians, to offer up your most fervent prayers to the Almighty God, who holds in his hands the hearts of kings and princes, beseech him to direct the counsels of our rulers, to inspire them with sentiments of moderation and compassion towards us. We ought to be more earnest at this juncture, in our supplications to heaven; *as some very honorable personages have encouraged us to hope for a mitigation of the penal laws.* Pray then the Almighty to give a blessing to these their generous designs, and to aid their counsels, in such a manner, that, whilst they intend to assist us, like kind benefactors, they may not, contrary to their intentions, by mistaking the means, most irretrievably destroy us.

To conclude, be just in your dealings, sober in your conduct, religious in your practice, avoid riots, quarrels, and tumults; and thus you will approve yourselves good citizens, peaceable subjects, and pious Christians.

Instead, however, of a repeal taking place of any of the penal laws, rumors began very generally to prevail, of its being the intention of Government to proceed to carry into effect a bill, that had been prepared by the former administration, for altering the law respecting the registry of the clergy. The existing law, which passed in the reign of Queen Anne, had been found too penal to admit of its being carried into execution; and thus, by an excess of tyranny, was the object of it wholly defeated. In the place of this law, it had been proposed to pass one with such provisions, that it should, like the other penal laws, execute itself; and upon this project being now revived, the Catholics, for the first time since 1704, took measures as a body, to vindicate their religious and civil principles. Mr. Charles O'Connor, the celebrated Irish scholar and antiquarian, with the assistance of Dr. Curry, the author of the Review of the Civil Wars of Ireland, and Mr. Wyse, of Waterford, exerted themselves with good effect in persuading their suffering countrymen of the necessity of coming forward to induce their rulers to admit them into a participation of the privileges of the Constitution. As a ground-work of their future labor, Dr. O'Keefe, the titular Bishop of Kildare, proposed, at a meeting held at Lord Trimbleston's, a declaration of the principles of their church, as far as they could bear upon their civil duties, to be signed by the chiefs of their body, and published as an answer to the misrepresentations and calumnies they had labored under since the reformation of the national religion: this declaration was unanimously adopted; it was signed by many clergymen and gentlemen of rank and property, and sent to Rome, as the act and deed of the Irish Catholics. It is as follows:

Whereas certain opinions and principles, inimical to good order and government, have been attributed to the Catholics, the existence of which we utterly deny; and whereas it is at this time peculiarly necessary to remove such imputations, and to give the most full and ample satisfaction to our Protestant brethren, that we hold no principle whatsoever, incompatible with our duty as men or as subjects, or repugnant to liberty, whether political, civil, or religious.

Now we, the Catholics of Ireland, for the removal of all such imputations, and in deference to the opinion of many respectable bodies of men, and individuals among our Protestant brethren, do hereby in the face of our country, of all Europe, and before God, make this our deliberate and solemn declaration:

1st. We abjure, disavow, and condemn the opinion, that princes, excommunicated by the pope and council, *or by any ecclesiastical authority whatsoever*, may therefore be deposed or murdered by their subjects, or any other persons. We hold such doctrine in detestation, as wicked and impious; and we declare that we do not believe, that either the pope, with or without a general council, or *any prelate or priest, or any ecclesiastical power whatsoever*, can absolve the subjects of this kingdom, or any of them, from their allegiance to his Majesty King George the Third, who is by authority of Parliament, the lawful King of this realm.

2d. We abjure, condemn, and detest, as unchristian and impious, the principle, that it is lawful to murder, destroy, or any ways injure any person whatsoever, for or under the pretence of being heretics; and we declare solemnly before God, that we believe that *no act, in itself unjust, immoral, or wicked, can ever be justified or excused by, or under pretence or color, that it was done either for the good of the church, or in obedience to any ecclesiastical power whatsoever.*

3d. We further declare, that we hold it as an unchristian and impious principle, that "no faith is to be kept with heretics." This doctrine we detest and reprobate, not only as *contrary* to our religion, but as destructive of morality, of society, and even of common honesty; and it is our firm belief, that an oath made to *any* person, not of the Catholic religion, is equally binding as if it were made to any Catholic whatsoever.

4th. We have been charged with holding as an article of our belief, that the pope, with or without the authority of a general council, or that certain ecclesiastical powers can acquit and absolve us, before God, from our oath of allegiance, or even from the just oaths and contracts entered into between man and man.

Now we do utterly renounce, abjure, and deny, that we hold or maintain any such belief, as being contrary to the peace and happiness of society, inconsistent with morality, and above all, *repugnant to the true spirit of the Catholic religion.*

5th. We do further declare, that we do not believe that the pope of Rome, or any other prince, prelate, state, or potentate, hath, or ought to have, any temporal or civil jurisdiction, power, superiority, or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within this realm.

6th. After what we have renounced, it is immaterial, in a political light, what may be our opinion or faith in other points, respecting the pope: however, for greater satisfaction we declare, that it is *not* an article of the Catholic faith, neither are we thereby required to believe or profess, "that the pope is infallible," or that we are bound to obey any order, in its own nature immoral, though the pope, or any ecclesiastical power, should issue or direct such order; but, *on the contrary*, we hold, that it would be *sinful* in us to pay any respect or obedience thereto.

7th. We further declare, that we do not believe that any sin whatsoever, committed by us, can be forgiven at the mere will of any pope, or of any priest, or of any person or persons whatsoever;

but, that *sincere sorrow for past sins*, a firm and sincere resolution, as far as may be in our power, to restore our neighbour's property or character, if we have trespassed on, or unjustly injured either; *a firm and sincere resolution to avoid future guilt*, and to atone to God, are *previous and indispensable* requisites to establish a well-founded expectation of forgiveness; and that any person who receives absolution without these previous requisites, so far from obtaining thereby any remission of his sins, incurs the additional guilt of violating a sacrament.

8th. We do hereby solemnly disclaim, and for ever renounce all interest in, and title to all forfeited lands, resulting from any rights, or supposed rights, of our ancestors, or any claim, title, or interest therein; nor do we admit any title, as a foundation of right, which is *not established and acknowledged by the laws of the realm, as they now stand.* We desire further, that whenever the patriotism, liberality, and justice of our countrymen, shall restore to us a participation in the elective franchise, no Catholic shall be permitted to vote at any election for members to serve in parliament, until he shall previously take an oath *to defend to the utmost of his power*, the arrangement of property in this country, *as established by the different acts of attainder and settlement.*

9th. It has been objected to us, that we wish to subvert the present church establishment, for the purpose of substituting a Catholic establishment in its stead: Now, we do hereby disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure any such intention; and further, if we shall be admitted into any share of the constitution, by our being restored to the right of elective franchise, we are ready, in the most solemn manner, to declare, that we will not exercise that privilege to disturb and weaken the establishment of the Protestant religion, or Protestant government in this country.

Though this declaration did not produce any change of conduct on the part of the English Government at that time, its failure can only be attributed to the obstinacy with which the principle of governing Ireland upon the system of separate interests between the Protestants and Catholics, was adhered to. That system is now happily exposed; and, though of late attempted to be revived by his Majesty's present Ministers, the intelligence and liberality of the present race of Irish Protestants has completely counteracted their designs. This declaration, though at first ineffectual, was re-published in 1792, and may surely be expected at last to open the eyes of mankind to the true character of the Irish Catholic, and to secure to them the reward which it deserves, the unlimited confidence of their King and fellow subjects, and the entire restoration of their constitutional rights.

In the year 1759, when it was known that a French force, under the command of Conflans, was collected to invade Ireland, the conduct of the Catholics on this, as it had uniformly been on similar occasions, was loyal in the extreme. Mr. O'Connor, Dr. Curry, and Mr. Wyse, had some time before, in 1757, succeeded in establishing a general committee of the Catholic body, formed by delegates of parishes, and the principal Catholic nobility and gentry. As soon as this invasion was announced to Parliament by a message from the Duke of Bedford, this committee was summoned to meet; and Mr. O'Connor having submitted to it the following address to the Lord Lieutenant, it was unanimously approved of.

May it please you Grace,

We, his Majesty's dutiful and faithful subjects, the Roman Catholic gentlemen, merchants, and citizens of Dublin, do, with the greatest respect, approach the illustrious representative of the best of Kings, with our hearty congratulations on those glorious successes, by sea and land, which have attended his Majesty's arms, in the prosecution of this just and necessary war.

We gratefully acknowledge the lenity extended to us by his most sacred Majesty, and by his royal father, of happy memory. Our allegiance, may it please your Grace, is confirmed by affection and gratitude; our religion commands it; and it shall be our invariable rule firmly and inviolably to adhere to it.

We are called to this duty, at the present time in particular, when a foreign enemy is meditating desperate attempts to interrupt the happiness and disturb the repose, which these kingdoms have so long enjoyed, under a Monarch, who places his chief glory in proving himself the common father of all his people: and we sincerely assure your Grace, that we are ready and willing, to the utmost of our abilities, to assist in supporting his Majesty's Government against all hostile attempts whatsoever.

Whenever, my Lord, it shall please the Almighty, that the legislative power of this realm shall deem the peaceable conduct of his Majesty's Catholic subjects of Ireland, for many years past, an object worthy of its favorable attention, we humbly hope means may then be devised, to render so numerous a body more useful members to the community, and more strengthening friends to the state, than they could possibly have hitherto been, under the restraint of the many penal laws against them. We most humbly beseech your Grace to represent to his Majesty these sentiments and resolutions of his Majesty's faithful subjects, the Roman Catholics of this metropolis, who sincerely wish, that a peace honorable to his Majesty, and advantageous to his kingdoms, may be the issue of the present war; and that the people of Ireland may be long governed by your Grace, a Viceroy, in whom wisdom, moderation, and justice, are so eminently conspicuous.

On that occasion, also, the wealthy individuals of this persuasion, offered to accommodate the Government with large sums of money, in case of necessity, to support the Protestant establishment against all its enemies; and the Catholics of the city of Cork, in a body, presented an address to the Lord Lieutenant, expressing their loyalty in the warmest terms of assurance. They professed the warmest indignation at the threatened invasion of the kingdom, by an enemy vainly flattered with the imaginary hope of assistance in Ireland, from the former attachments of their deluded predecessors. They assured his Grace, that such schemes were altogether inconsistent with their principles and intentions; and that they would, to the utmost exertion of their abilities, with their lives and fortunes, join in the defence and support of his Majesty's royal person and government, against all invaders whatsoever.[1]

These circumstances are proofs of no ordinary fidelity in the Irish Catholics to the House of Brunswick. They were, however, of no avail in mitigating the rigor of the magistracy in the execution of the penal laws, or in inducing the British Government to repeal any part of them; for the reign of George II. closed without any grateful acknowledgment being made to them for the steadiness, the moderation, and the loyalty, which they had displayed on so many trying occasions.

GEORGE III.

Though the first measure of this reign, the royal recommendation to Parliament to make the judges independent of the crown, bespoke the determination of his Majesty to respect the feelings and confirm the rights and liberties of his subjects; still the unfortunate Catholics of Ireland were doomed to suffer under new pains and penalties.

In the year 1776, an act of Parliament was passed,[2] by which one or more justices of the peace, and all sheriffs and chief magistrates of cities and towns corporate, within their respective jurisdictions, may from time to time, as well by night as by day, search for and seize all arms and ammunition belonging to any Papist not entitled to keep the same, or in the hands of any person in trust, for a Papist; and for that purpose enter any dwelling-house, outhouse, office, field, or other place belonging to a Papist, or to any other person where such magistrate has reasonable cause to *suspect* any such arms or ammunition shall be concealed; and *on suspicion*, after search, may summon and examine on oath, the person *suspected* of such concealment.

---

[1] Smollett's History of England, 4, 69.
[2] 15th and 16th Geo. III. c. 21. § 15.

By the 17th clause of this act, Papists refusing to deliver up or declare such arms as they, or any with their privity, have, or hindering the delivery, or refusing to discover on oath, or without cause neglecting to appear on summons to be examined before a magistrate concerning the same, shall, on conviction, be punished by fine and imprisonment, or *such corporeal punishment of pillory or whipping*, as the Court shall in their discretion think proper.

In the year 1782, a clause was introduced into an act,[1] by which no person shall be admitted into the Society of the King's Inns as a student, who shall not, at the time of his admission, be a Protestant.

In the same year, an act[2] was passed, by the 3d clause of which, all statutes made in England or Great Britain, and all such clauses and provisions contained in any statute there made, as relate to the taking any oath or oaths, or making or subscribing any declaration in Ireland, or to any penalty or disability for omitting the same, shall be accepted, used, and executed in Ireland.

This act referred to: 1st, the English act of 3d William and Mary, c. 2. sect. 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, by which the oath of supremacy mentioned in 2 Eliz. 1. c. 1. is abrogated, and a new oath of supremacy is required to be taken by all persons admitted in Ireland to hold any civil or military office, and by members of both Houses of Parliament: 2dly, to the English act of 1st Anne, stat. 2. c. 17. requiring all persons to take the oath of abjuration, prescribed by the English acts of 13th Wm. III. c. 6. and 1st. Anne, st. 1. c. 22d: 3dly, to the English act of 6th Geo. III. c. 53. § 2. declaring that from the 1st August, 1776, the oath of abjuration, by this act appointed to be taken in Great Britain, shall be the oath of abjuration, to be taken in Ireland.

Though this clause of the 21st and 22d of Geo. III. c. 48. has attracted very little public attention, it was of no less import than that of being the first legal exclusion of Catholics from sitting in the Irish Parliament. They had been excluded *de facto* by their voluntary submission to the English act of 3d William and Mary, but not *de jure* till this act of 21st and 22d Geo. III. which made the act of 3d William and Mary just mentioned, binding in Ireland.[1]

---

[1] 21st and 22d Geo. III. c. 32. § 2.

[2] 21st and 22d Geo. III. c. 48. § 3.

This circumstance, which has always been overlooked, even by the Catholics themselves, proves how readily they have been inclined at all times to submit to the authority of Government. And it also proves how unfounded those arguments are, which maintain that the exclusion of the Catholics of Ireland from Parliament, is a principle on which the family of his Majesty was placed upon the throne. It completely overturns the system of erroneous reasoning concerning the coronation oath, which of late has been so common; and, so far as the meaning of this oath is at issue, it reduces the question to this simple point, whether the king can conscientiously place the Catholics of Ireland in the same condition, with respect to sitting in Parliament, in which they had continued till the twenty-second year of his own reign.

In 1785 an act was passed[2] for granting 4000*l.* to be expended in apprentice fees, to such tradesmen or manufacturers, as should take children from charter-schools or the Foundling Hospital; but it was expressly provided that the children should be bound to none but Protestant tradesmen and manufacturers.

The whole code of the penal statutes against the Catholics of Ireland is now laid before the view of the reader, under which they so long and so patiently languished; statutes unexampled for their inhumanity, their unwarrantableness, and their impolicy, which were adopted to exterminate a race of men already crushed and broken by the longest series of calamities which one nation had ever the opportunity of inflicting upon another. They were framed against Christians under the pretence of securing religion; they were the work of Protestants, than whom no sect has cried out more loudly against persecution when Protestants were the martyrs. They were sanctioned by a nation who owed its liberties, and by monarchs who owed their throne, to a solemn covenant that such penal disabilities should never exist.[1] Here may we not inquire, if the English nation, legislature, and king, *have not a duty to fulfil towards the Irish Catholics even greater than that of justice*—a duty of *compunction*, *of repentance*, and *atonement*? The faith of a solemn treaty made with them has been broken: it is not enough that it has been in part re-established, it ought to be religiously fulfilled. They have been ruled with tyranny: it is not enough that the tyranny should be relaxed, it should cease altogether. They have been driven from the pale of the Constitution: it is not enough that they should be allowed to pass its barriers, they should range free and uncontrolled through all its rights.

---

[1] The first Irish parliament summoned by William, having met on the 5th of October, 1692, immediately after the election of a speaker and his being seated, "a motion was made for the reading of a late act of parliament, made in England in the third year of their Majesties' reign, intituled 'An act for abrogating the oath of supremacy in Ireland and appointing other oaths,' upon reading whereof, the house immediately proceeded to the swearing of their members, and they being sworn the house adjourned." (*Irish Com. Jour.* 2. *P.* 9.)

It does not appear by the Journals that any objection was made to this motion or that any Catholic had been elected to serve in this parliament, notwithstanding this English act was not binding in Ireland. Nor is any mention made in the historians of that day, concerning the grounds upon which the Catholics submitted to it. The submissive forbearance of them under a most severe extension of the penal code, is the only point relating to them, which has arrested their notice. *Plowden*, 1. 198.

[2] 25th of George III. c. 48 § 11. and 12.

That this system of slow political torture, was not warranted by any alleged delinquency on their part is notorious, for it was devised and perfected in times of profound tranquillity. That they were not deserving even of the suspicion of being disloyal subjects, is proved by their signal forbearance, which has preserved the empire from the calamitous consequences of such flagitious misgovernment; and that, on the contrary, they fully merited the confidence and protection of the legislature, no fair and candid mind can deny, when it gives to their conduct, in strictly adhering to the stipulations of the treaty of Limerick, and to their allegiance to the house of Brunswick, the just value to which it is entitled.

Having now reached the utmost point to which the penal statutes extended, which seems to be as far as human invention, quickened by mixed feelings of alarm, of bigotry, and of pride, could go, we should not be excusable on general grounds, if we neglected to record its effects.

But there is even a nearer interest in this examination. At a period when the state of Ireland so much occupies the attention of the legislature and of the public; when it is admitted on all sides, that the prosperity and security of England herself must rise or fall with the prosperity and security of Ireland; and when the events of each succeeding day prove the absolute necessity of some measures to ameliorate her condition and show that things cannot go on, as they are, without the inevitable destruction of the British Empire; it will be of great importance to be able to form an accurate opinion upon the effects which were the result of the penal statutes.

It appears from unquestionable authority, that, during the interval that elapsed between the surrender of Limerick, and the total infraction of the treaty in 1704, by the act to prevent the further growth of Popery, the toleration which the Catholics experienced by virtue of that treaty, produced its natural consequences. The security they enjoyed restored industry and plenty of all things: useful arts were introduced; the land cultivated; and a fine island, reduced to a desert by the late war, soon assumed a new face. In fact, Ireland was never happier than during this interval of religious toleration.[1] Of the effects of the penal laws in entirely reversing this order of things, Lord Taffe, in his valuable tract on Irish affairs, gives the following description.—"Those penalties and interdicts (by the laws of Anne) had their natural effects in the dispeopling greatly the three fine provinces, wherein the bulk of Catholics reside. They took their effect in putting a stop to the cultivation began in King William's reign. No sooner were the Catholics excluded from durable and profitable tenures, than they commenced graziers, and laid aside agriculture: they ceased from draining and enclosing their farms, and building good houses, as occupations unsuited to the new part assigned them in our national economy. They fell to wasting the lands they were virtually forbid to cultivate, the business of pasturage being compatible with such a conduct and requiring also little industry and less labor in the management."[2]

---

[1] See the articles of Limerick, supra.

In the year 1723, the wretchedness of the people of Ireland was so great, that the Duke of Grafton, in a speech from the throne, recommended Parliament to take measures for relieving them. The distress, however, continued; and in a petition presented to the House of Commons, in the same year, by the woollen manufacturers, they say, "that the woollen manufacture of this kingdom, which is confined to our own consumption, has of late been so considerably lessened, that several thousand families have been forced to beg alms and charity of good christians; and that a collection had lately been made throughout he whole city to relieve them."[3]

Primate Boulter, in a letter of the 25th of March, 1722, to the Duke of Newcastle, bears testimony to this wretched state of Ireland; he says, "Since I came here in the year 1725, there was almost a famine amongst the poor; last year the dearness of corn was such, that thousands of families quitted their habitations, to seek bread elsewhere, and many hundreds perished:"[4] again on the 23rd of November, 1728, he says, in writing to the Duke, "I am sorry I am obliged to give your Grace so melancholy an account of the state of the kingdom, as I shall in this letter."

But one of the most pernicious effects of these penal laws was,

[1] Observations on the Affairs of Ireland, by Lord Taffe, p. 4.

[2] Ibid. p. 11.

[3] Com. Jour. v. 3. p. 24.

[4] Letters, p. 226.

the emigration of the principal Catholic families to the Continent. They carried with them what would otherwise have been the materials of the civilisation, tranquillity, and prosperity of their own country; they left the mass of the Catholic population without the influence of men of education and property, to direct and control their conduct; and in the place of serving their own native land, they filled with the highest credit to themselves the situation of statesmen and generals, in those nations which were hostile to the interest of Great Britain.

Of the visible effect these laws had produced in their avowed objects of propagating the Protestant religion, and promoting the national prosperity, it is impossible to give a more able, or a more accurate description than the following by Mr. Arthur Young, who was in Ireland at the period we now treat of:[1] "While property lay exposed to the practices of power, the great body of the people, who had been stripped of their all, were more enraged than converted; they adhered to the persuasion of their forefathers, with the steadiest and most determined zeal; while the priests, actuated by the spirit of a thousand inducements, made proselytes among the common Protestants, in defiance of every danger. And the great glaring fact yet remains, and is even admitted by the warmest advocates for the laws of discovery, that the established religion has not gained upon the Catholic in point of numbers; on the contrary, that the latter has been rather on the increase. Public lists have been returned from the several dioceses which confirm this fact; and the intelligence I received on my journey spoke the same language.

"As it is the great body of the common people that forms the strength of a country, when willing subjects, and its weakness when ill-affected, this fact is a decision of the question: After seventy years undisturbed operation, the system adopted in Queen Anne's reign has failed in this great aim, and meets at this day with a more numerous and equally determined body of Catholics, than it had to oppose when first promulgated.—Has not the experience of every age and every nation, proved that the effect is invariable and univeral? Let a religion be what it may, and under whatever circumstances, no system of persecution ever yet had any other effect, than to confirm its professors in their tenets, and spread their doctrines, instead of restraining them. The great plea of the Roman Catholic priests, and their merit with their congregations, are the dangers they hazard, and the persecutions they suffer for the sake of their faith; arguments that have, and ever will have weight, while human nature continues formed of its present materials.

---

[1] 1778.

"But if these exertions of a succession of ignorant legislatures have failed continually in propagating the religion of Government, much more have they failed in the great object of natural prosperity. The only considerable manufacture in Ireland, which carries in all parts the appearance of industry, is the linen, and it ought never to be forgotten that this is solely confined to the Protestant parts of the kingdom. The poor Catholics in the south of Ireland spin wool generally, but the purchaser of their labor, and the whole worsted trade, is in the hands of the Quakers of Clonmel, Carrick, and Bandon, &c. The fact is, the professors of that religion are under such discouragements, that they cannot engage in any trade which requires both industry and capital. If they succeed and make a fortune, what are they to do with it? They can neither buy land, nor take a mortgage, nor even fine down the rent of a lease. Where is there a people in the world to be found industrious under such circumstances?

"It is no superficial view I have taken of this matter in Ireland; and being at Dublin at the time a very trifling part of these laws was agitated in Parliament, I attended the debates, with my mind open to conviction, and an auditor for the mere purposes of information. I have conversed on the subject with most distinguished characters of the kingdom, and I cannot after all but declare that the scope, purport, and aim of the laws of discovery, as executed, are not against the Catholic religion, which increases under them, but against the industry and property of whosoever professes that religion. In vain has it been said, that consequence and power follow property, and that the attack is made in order to wound the doctrine through its property. If such was the intention, I reply, that seventy years experience prove the folly and futility of it. Those laws have crushed all the industry, and wrested most of the property from the Catholics; but the religion triumphs; it is thought to increase. Those who have handed about calculations to prove a decrease, admit on the face of them, that it will require 4000 YEARS to make converts of the whole, supposing the work to go on in future, as it has in the past time. But the whole pretence is an affront to common sense, for it implies, that you will lessen a religion, by persecuting it: all history and experience condemn such a proposition.

"The system pursued in Ireland has had no other tendency but that of driving out of the kingdom all the personal wealth of the Catholics, and prohibiting their industry within it. The face of the country, every object, in short, which presents itself to the eye of a traveller, tells him how effectually this has been done. I urge it not as an argument, the whole kingdom speaks it as a fact. We have seen that this conduct has not converted the people to the religion of Government; and instead of adding to the internal security, it has endangered it: if therefore it does not add to the national prosperity, for what purpose, but that of private tyranny, could it have been embraced and persisted in? Mistaken ideas of private interest account for the actions of individuals; but what could have influenced the British Government to permit a system which must inevitably prevent the island from even becoming of the importance which nature intended?"[1]

Of the state of the agriculture of Ireland at this period, a tolerable accurate idea may be formed from the words of the same author.—"I have reason to believe that five pounds sterling per English acre, expended all over Ireland, which amounts to 88,341, 136*l.* would not more than build, fence, plant, drain, and improve that country, to be upon a par in those respects with England."[2] The prices also of the produce of land, afford proof of the general poverty of the kingdom. In 1778, butter sold for 5¾d. per lb.—mutton, 2¾d.—beef, 2½d.—pork, 2¼d.—veal, 3½d.—a fat turkey for 10¾d.—a goose for 8½d.—and a chicken for 2½d.[3]

From these several authorities upon the state of Ireland in 1778, much information may be collected concerning the causes of many of those peculiar circumstances which, at this day, belong to that country. If it is asked, why the people of Ireland are so illiterate? The answer that presents itself is, look to the penal laws, that deprived them, till a late period, of education. If it is asked, why they are poor? The same answer must be given, look to the penal laws. If it is asked, why the lower orders eat vegetables only, and live in hovels? Still the same answer, look to the penal laws. If it is asked why there is no class of yeomanry in Ireland like that in England? The answer is because the penal laws prohibited industry, and prevented the small landholder from acquiring either property or consequence in the one country, as he might do in the other. If it is asked, why the people are discontented and dislike England? This answer only can be given, because from England they received this penal code, under which they have endured, for above a century, every species of calamity, contrary to the positive stipulations of a sacred and solemn treaty.

It was in the year 1774, that the Irish legislature passed the first act towards conciliating the Catholics, "an act to enable his Majesty's subjects of whatever persuasion, to testify their allegiance to him."[4] Which is as follows:

Whereas many of his Majesty's subjects in this kingdom are desirous to testify their loyalty and allegiance to his Majesty, and their abhorrence of certain doctrines imputed to them, and to remove jealousies which hereby have for a length of time subsisted between them, and others his Majesty's loyal subjects; but upon account of their religious tenets are, by the laws now in being, prevented from giving public assurances of such allegiance, and of their real principles, and good will, and affection towards their fellow subjects; *in order, therefore, to give such persons an opportunity of testifying their allegiance to his Majesty, and good will towards the present constitution of this kingdom, and to promote peace and industry amongst the inhabitants thereof, be it enacted* by the King's most excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that from and after the first day of June, one thousand seven hundred and seventy-four, it shall and may be lawful for any person professing the Popish religion, to go before the Judges of his Majesty's Court of King's Bench, any Justice of Peace for the county in which he does or shall reside, or before any Magistrate of any city or town corporate, wherein he does or shall reside, and there take and subscribe the oath of allegiance and declaration, hereinafter mentioned; which oath and declaration such Judges of the King's Bench, Justices of the Peace and Magistrates, are hereby enabled and required to administer.

---

[1] Young's Tour, vol. 2. 135. Eng. Ed. [2] Young's Tour, App. [3] Ibid.
[4] 13 and 14th Geo. III. c. 35.

"I A. B. do take Almighty God, and his only son Jesus Christ my Redeemer, to witness, that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to our most gracious Sovereign Lord King George the Third, and him will defend to the utmost of my power against all conspiracies and attempts whatever, that shall be made against his person, crown, and dignity; and I will do my utmost endeavour to disclose and make known to his Majesty and his heirs, all treasons and traitorous conspiracies which may be formed against him or them; and I do faithfully promise to maintain, support, and defend, to the utmost of my power, the succession of the crown in his Majesty's Family, against any person or persons whatsoever; hereby *utterly renouncing and abjuring any obedience or allegiance unto the person taking upon himself the style and title of Prince of Wales in the* life-time of his father, and who, since his death, is said to have assumed the style and title of King of Great Britain and Ireland, by *the name of Charles the Third,* and to any other person claiming or pretending a right to the Crown of these realms; and I do swear, that I *do reject and detest* as unchristian and impious to believe, *that it is lawful to murder or destroy any person or persons whatsoever,* for or under pretence of their being heretics; and also that unchristian and impious principle, *that no faith is to be kept with heretics;* I further declare, that it is no article of my faith, and that I do renounce, reject, and abjure the opinion, *that Princes excommunicated by the Pope and Council*, or by any authority of the See of Rome, or by any authority whatsoever, may be deposed and murdered by their subjects, or by any person whatsoever; and I do promise, that I will not hold, maintain, or abet, any such opinion, or any other opinion contrary to what is expressed in this declaration; and I do declare that I do not believe that *the Pope of Rome*, or any other foreign Prince, Prelate, State, or Potentate, *hath or ought to have any temporal or civil jurisdiction*, power, superiority, or pre-eminence, directly, or indirectly, within this realm, and I do solemnly, in the presence of God, and of his only Son Jesus Christ my Redeemer, profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words of this oath, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatever, and without any dispensation already granted by the Pope, or any authority of the See of Rome, or any person whatever; and without thinking that I am or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration, or any part thereof, although the Pope, or any other person or persons, or authority whatsoever, shall dispense with, or annul the same, or declare that it was null and void from the beginning.[1] "So help me God."

And be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, that the officer of the Court of King's Bench, Justices of the Peace, and Magistrates of the city and towns corporate, shall yearly, within twenty-one days after the first of December, return to the clerk of the Privy Council of this kingdom, or his deputy, a true and perfect list, under his or their hand, of every such Papist as shall, in the course of the preceding year, have taken and subscribed such oath, in which list the quality, condition, title, and place of abode of such Papist, shall be specified.

About the same time, fearing that their grievances were not known to his Majesty, the Catholics prepared a Petition; which was presented to Lord Buckinghamshire by Lord Fingal, Mr. Preston, and Mr. Dermot, in order that it might be transmitted by him to the King.

To the King's most Excellent Majesty, the humble Address and Petition of the Roman Catholics of Ireland.

Most Gracious Sovereign,

We your Majesty's most dutiful subjects, the Roman Catholics of your kingdom of Ireland, with hearts full of loyalty, but overwhelmed with affliction, and depressed by our calamitous and ruined circumstances, beg leave to lay at your Majesty's feet, some small part of those numerous and insupportable grievances under which we have long groaned, not only without any act of disobedience, but even without murmur or complaint; in hopes that our inviolable submission and unaltered patience under those severe pressures, would fully confute the accusation of seditious principles, with which we have been unfortunately and unjustly charged.

We are deeply sensible of your Majesty's clemency, in moderating the rigorous execution of some of the laws against us: but we humbly beg leave to represent, that several, and those the most severe and distressing of those laws, *execute themselves with the most fatal certainty*, and that your Majesty's clemency cannot, in the smallest degree, interpose for their mitigation, otherwise your Roman Catholic subjects would most cheerfully acquiesce in that resource, and rest with an absolute and unbounded assurance on your Majesty's *princely generosity*, and your pious regard to the rights of private conscience.

We are, may it please your Majesty, a numerous and very industrious part of your Majesty's subjects, and yet by no industry, by no honest endeavours on our part, is it in our power to acquire or to hold, almost any secure or permanent property whatsoever; we are not only disqualified to purchase, but are disabled from occupying any land, even in farm, except on a tenure extremely scanted both in profit and in time; and if we should venture to expend any thing on the melioration of land thus held, by building, by inclosure, by draining, or by any other species of improvement, so very necessary in this country; so far would our services be from bettering our fortunes, that these are precisely the very circumstances, which, as the law now stands, must necessarily disqualify us from continuing those farms, for any time in our possession.

Whilst the endeavours of our industry are thus discouraged, (no less, we humbly apprehend, to the detriment of the national prosperity, and the diminution of your Majesty's revenue, than to our particular ruin) there are a set of men, who, instead of exercising any honest occupation in the commonwealth, make it their employment to pry into our miserable property, to drag us into the courts, and to compel us to confess on our oaths, and under the penalties of perjury, whether we have in any instance acquired a property, in the smallest degree exceeding what the rigor of the law has admitted; and in such cases the informers, without any other merit than that of their discovery, are invested (to the daily ruin of several innocent industrious families) not only with the surplus in which the law is exceeded, but in the whole body of the estate and interest so discovered, and it is our grief that this evil is likely to continue and increase, as informers have, in this country, almost worn off the infamy, which in all ages, and in all other countries, has attended their character, and have grown into some repute by the frequency and success of their practices.

And this most gracious Sovereign, though extremely grievous, is far from being the only or most oppressive particular, in which our distress is connected with the breach of the rules of honor and morality. By the laws now in force in this kingdom, a son, however undutiful or profligate, shall, merely by the merit of conforming to the established religion, not only deprive the Roman Catholic father of that free and full possession of his estate, that power to mortgage or otherwise dispose of it, which the exigencies of his affairs may require; but shall himself have full liberty immediately to mortgage or otherwise alienate the reversion of that estate, from his family for ever; a regulation by which a father, contrary to the order of nature, is put under the power of his son, and through which an early dissoluteness is not only suffered, but encouraged, by giving a pernicious privilege, the frequent use of which has broken the hearts of many deserving parents, and entailed poverty and despair on some of the most ancient and opulent families in this kingdom.

Even when the parent has the good fortune to escape this calamity in his life-time, yet he has at his death, the melancholy and almost certain prospect of leaving neither peace nor fortune to his children; for by that law, which bestows the whole fortune on the first conformist, or, on non-conformity, disperses it among the children, incurable jealousies and animosities have arisen; a total extinction of principle and of natural benevolence has ensued; whilst we are obliged to consider our own offspring and the brothers of our own blood, as our most dangerous enemies; the blessing of Providence on our families, in a numerous issue, is converted into the most certain means of their ruin and depravation: we are, most gracious Sovereign, neither permitted to enjoy the few broken remains of our patrimonial inheritance, nor by our industry to acquire any secure establishment to our families.

In this deplorable situation, let it not be considered, we earnestly beseech your Majesty, as an instance of presumption or discontent, that we thus adventure to lay open to your Majesty's mercy, a very small part of our uncommon sufferings; what we have concealed under a respectful silence, would form a far longer, and full as melancholy a recital; we speak with reluctance, though we feel with anguish; we respect from the bottom of our hearts that legislation under which we suffer; but we humbly conceive it is impossible to procure redress without complaint, or to make a complaint, that by some construction may not appear to convey blame: and nothing we assure your Majesty, should have extorted from us even these complaints, but the strong necessity we find ourselves under of employing every lawful, humble endeavour, lest the whole purpose of our lives and labors should prove only the means of confirming to ourselves, and entailing on our posterity, inevitable beggary, and the most abject servitude; a servitude the more intolerable, as it is suffered amidst that liberty, that peace, and that security, which, under your Majesty's benign influence, is spread all around us, and which we alone, of all your Majesty's subjects, are rendered incapable of partaking.

In all humility we implore, that our principles may not be estimated by the inflamed charge of controversial writers, nor our practices measured by the events of those troubled periods, when parties have run high (though these have been often misrepresented, and always cruelly exaggerated to our prejudice); but that we may be judged by our own actions, and in our own times; and we humbly offer it to your most equitable and princely consideration, that we do not rest the proof of our sincerity on words, but on things; on our dutiful, peaceable, submissive behaviour for more than fourscore years: and though it will be considered as too severe to form any opinion of great bodies, by the practice of individuals, *yet if in all that time, amongst all our people, in the daily increase of severe laws against us, one treasonable insurrection or one treasonable conspiracy can be proved; if amongst our clergy, one seditious sermon can be shown to have been preached;* we will readily admit that there is good reason for continuing the present laws in all their force against us; but if, on the contrary, (we speak in full confidence,) it can be shown that our clergy have ever exerted their utmost endeavours to enforce submission to your Majesty's Government, and obedience to your laws; if it can be shown that these endeavours have always been most strenuous in times of public danger, or when any accident tended to create a ferment amongst the people; if our laity have frequently offered what we are always ready to fulfil) to hazard their lives and for(tunesfor your Majesty's service; if we have willingly bound up the fruits of our discouraged industry with the fortune of your Majesty's Government in the public loans; then, we humbly hope, we may be admitted to a small portion of mercy, and that that behaviour, which your Majesty's benignity and condescension will esteem a merit in our circumstances, may entitle us, not to reward, but to such toleration as may enable us to become useful citizens to our country, and subjects as profitable as we are loyal to your Majesty.

Permit us, most gracious Sovereign, on this occasion, to reiterate the assurances of our unshaken loyalty, which all our sufferings have not been able to abate; of our sincere zeal for your Majesty's service, of our attachment to the constitution of our country, and of our warmest gratitude for your Majesty's continual indulgence, and for the late instance of favor we have experienced from Parliament, in enabling us, consistent with our religious tenets, to give a legal proof of our sentiments upon these points. And we humbly hope, that the alacrity and eagerness with which we have seized this first, though long wished opportunity, of testifying, in the most solemn and public manner, our inviolable fidelity to your Majesty, our real principles, and our good-will and affection towards our fellow-subjects, will extinguish all jealousies, and remove those imputations, which alone have hitherto held us forth in the light of enemies to your Majesty, and to the State. And if any thing farther can be suggested or devised, whereby we can, by our actions, more fully evince our sincerity, we shall consider such an opportunity of demonstrating our real loyalty, as an high favor, and shall be deficient in no act whatever, which does not amount to a renunciation of that religious profession which we value more than our lives, and which it cannot be suspected we hold from obstinacy or a contempt of the laws, since it has not been taken up by ourselves, but has, from time immemorial, been handed down to us from our ancestors.

We derive no small consolation, most gracious Sovereign, from considering, that the most severe and rigorous of the laws against us had been enacted before the accession of your Majesty's most illustrious House to the Throne of these kingdoms: we therefore indulge the more sanguine hopes, that the mitigation of them, and the establishment of peace, industry, and universal happiness, amongst all your loyal subjects, may be one of the blessings of your Majesty's reign. *And though we might plead in favor of such relaxation, the express words of a solemn treaty, entered into with us, by your Majesty's royal predecessor, King William, (which has been forfeited by no disobedience on our part,)* yet we neither wish, nor desire, to receive any thing, but as a mere act of your Majesty's clemency, and of the indulgence and equity of your Parliament.

That this act of truly loyal beneficence and justice may be added to the other instances of your Majesty's august virtues, and that the deliverance of a faithful and distressed people may be one of those distinguishing acts of your reign, which shall transmit its memory to the love, gratitude, and veneration, of our latest posterity, is the humble prayer of, &c. &c.[1]

In the year 1778,[2] an act passed "for the relief of his Majesty's subjects of this kingdom, professing the Popish religion." The preamble of which contains a confirmation of every thing that has been already advanced, concerning the loyalty of the Catholics, and a declaration on the part of the King and Parliament, respecting the policy of admitting the Catholics into a full participation of the blessings of the Constitution, which is a complete recognition of their right to enjoy them. It states "And Whereas, from their uniform peaceable behaviour for a long series of years, it appears reasonable and expedient to relax the same, (the laws of Anne); and it must tend not only to the cultivation and improvement of this kingdom, but to the prosperity and strength of all his Majesty's dominions, *that his subjects of all denominations, should enjoy the blessings of a free constitution and should be bound to each other by mutual interest and mutual affection, &c.*"

---

[1] This petition is from the pen of Mr. Burke.

[2] 17th and 18th of Geo. III. c. 49.

By this act Papists, provided they take the oath and declaration of 13th and 14th of Geo. III. c. 35. are admitted to the following privileges.—They may take land on leases not exceeding 999 years, or determinable upon any number of lives not exceeding five.

The lands of Papists are to be descendable, deviseable, and transferable, as fully as if the same were in the seizure of any other of his Majesty's subjects.

Papists are rendered capable to hold and enjoy all estates which may descend, be devised, or transferred to them.

No maintenance is to be hereafter granted to a conforming child of a Papist, out of the personal property of such Papist, except out of such leases as may be taken under this act.

And the conformity of the eldest son is not to alter hereafter the Popish parent's estate.

In the year 1782, another act passed "for the further relief of his Majesty's subjects of this kingdom, professing the Popish religion."[1]

The preamble of this act states: "Whereas all such of his Majesty's subjects in this kingdom, of whatever persuasion, as have heretofore taken and subscribed, or shall hereafter take and subscribe, the oath of allegiance and declaration prescribed by an act passed in the 13th and 14th year of his present Majesty's reign, entitled an act to enable his Majesty's subjects, of whatever persuasion, to testify their allegiance to him, *ought to be considered as good and loyal subjects to his Majesty, his crown and government:* and whereas a continuance of several of the laws formerly enacted, and still in force in this kingdom, against persons professing the Popish religion, is therefore unnecessary, in respect to those who have taken, or shall take the said oath, and is injurious to the real wealth and prosperity of Ireland, therefore, &c."

---

[1] 21st and 22d Geo. III. c. 24.

By this act Catholics, provided they take this oath, may purchase or take lands, or any interest therein, except advowsons or boroughs returning members of Parliament, and dispose of the same by will or otherwise; and Popish ecclesiastics, on the same condition, and registering their name and abode with the register of the diocese, are discharged from all penalties.

This act repeals so much of 8th Anne as subjects a Papist to fine and imprisonment, on his refusal to testify on oath before two Justices of the Peace, when and where he heard the Popish mass celebrated, and the names of the persons celebrating it; and so much of 7th Wm. III. c. 5. as subjects any Papist, who shall have in his possession any horse of the value of *5l.* or more, to the penalties therein mentioned; and so much of 8th Anne, as enables the Lord Lieutenant to seize any horse belonging to a Papist, upon a prospect of invasion or rebellion. It also repeals so much of 9th Geo. II. c. 6. as enables grand juries to reimburse such persons as have been robbed by privateers in time of war, for their losses, and to levy the same on the goods of Papists only; and so much of 6th Geo. I. c. 10. as subjects Papists, who shall not provide a Protestant watchman to watch in their turn, to certain penalties; and so much of 2d Anne, c. 6, as subjects Papists, who took any house or came to dwell in Limerick, after the year 1703, or within the town of Galway, to certain penalties.

In the same year was likewise passed an act to allow persons professing the Popish religion, to teach school in this kingdom, and for regulating the education of Papists, and also to repeal parts of certain laws relative to the guardianship of their children.[1]

The preamble states: "Whereas several of the laws made in this kingdom, relative to the education of Papists, or persons professing the Popish religion, are considered as too severe, and have not answered the desired effect."

This act repeals so much of 7th Wm. III. c. 4. and 8th of Anne, c. 3. as subjects Catholics, who shall publicly teach school, or privately instruct youth, to the like penalties as any Popish regular convict, provided they take the oaths of 13th and 14th of George III. c. 35; and it enables Catholics, except ecclesiastics, to be guardians.

Of the numerous individuals, who at this time distinguished themselves for their exertions in favor of the Catholics, there was no one to whom they were under greater obligations than to the late Mr Burke. He wrote for them the Petition which was presented to the King in 1774. In the English House of Commons in

---

[1] 21st and 22d Geo. III. c. 62.

1778 he was the first to declare the necessity of concessions being made to them; he said that "Ireland was now the chief dependence of the British crown, and that it particularly behoved that country to admit the Irish nation to the privileges of British citizens"[1] and in the year 1782, he wrote his celebrated letter to Lord Kenmare, in which he so ably exposes the folly, injustice, and tyranny of the penal laws.

It certainly is a fact of no small importance in favor of the wisdom of unlimited concession to the Catholics, that this great statesman, the advocate for existing establishments, and who was the first and most formidable opponent to the progress of the jacobinical principles of France, should have advised it, and incessantly fowarded it by his powerful talents and extensive influence.

But the Catholics were indebted, not only to the labors of their friends, but also to the great revolution which was going on at this period in America, for the success of the first concessions that were made to them. This soon appeared very evident; an attempt was made by Mr. James Fitzgerald, a few months before the introduction of the act of 17. 18. Geo. III. to obtain for them a power to take leases of lands for 61 years, and this attempt failed. But soon afterwards, when the intelligence arrived of the defeat of the British forces in America, the same Parliament, on the recommendation of the Government, passed an act for enabling them to take land on leases for 999 years.

It was not, however, till the British Government were obliged to transport the whole of the British army from Ireland to America, and thus leave it exposed to the invasion of France, that the Catholics became of sufficient importance in the eyes either of their own Protestant countrymen, or of the British Government, to be attended to and caressed by them. The only alternative then left for the Protestants to adopt, was either to promote a union of sects in the common defence of the kingdom, or to make up their minds to fall an easy prey to the arms of France. Upon this principle of preservation, by an oblivion of all past animosities, the volunteers were embodied, and composed indiscriminately of Catholics and Protestants. But, in proportion as the danger of invasion diminished, they naturally turned their attention to the grievances, that both sects experienced at the hands of the British Government, and soon became an armed association for the attainment of political rights.[2]

---

[1] 8th Eng. Deb. p. 185, 1st April 1778.

[2] "In 1782, when the treasury had no supply, but was in fact bankrupt; when a French fleet appeared off Cork: when the army was only 4000 men and unprovided; it was entirely owing to the wealth of the Roman Catholics that that country was put into a posture of defence, and saved

In this appeal to arms, in open resistance to the power of Great Britain, for the purpose of compelling her to grant to Ireland the independence of her legislature, and a reform of her Parliament, the Protestants took the lead. But the contention between them and the British Government was not one of arms, because Great Britain had no troops with which to dispute with the volunteers, but one of political manœuvring. It was plain, that to whichever party the Catholics attached themselves, victory would belong. The Government, therefore, in order to secure them, passed the acts of 1778 and 1782; while the Protestants, on the other hand, endeavoured to conciliate them by public resolutions and declarations in favor of their complete emancipation. The Dungannon convention, which met in February 1782, and was composed of the representatives of 143 Protestant volunteer corps, resolved, with two dissenting voices only, "that they held the right of private judgment, in matters of religion, to be equally sacred in others as themselves; therefore, that, as Christians and Protestants, they rejoiced in the relaxation of the penal laws against their Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, and that they conceived the measure to be fraught with the happiest consequences to the union and prosperity of Ireland."

These liberal declarations on the part of this meeting, and the general tenor of the conduct of the Protestants throughout Ireland towards the Catholics, secured their cordial concurrence, and the British Government were, at length, reluctantly obliged to concede the favorite object of an independent Irish legislature.

The Protestants now proceeded to attempt to carry their other great object, a parliamentary reform; and, after the sense of the kingdom had been expressed, at various public meetings, to be decidedly in favor of it, they determined to hold a convention in Dublin, for the purpose of impressing upon Government and Parliament the necessity of acceding to their demand. In the mean time, a division of opinion had manifested itself among some of the northern corps of volunteers, on the Catholic question; and Lord Charlemont and other persons had declared themselves hostile to further concessions. This circumstance afforded the Government an easy opportunity of defeating the object of the convention; they contrived to have a motion made for connecting the emancipation of the Catholics with the question of

from the invasion of the enemy—whereas, had they been disposed to be disloyal upon that occasion, and to have made use of that power which they actually possessed, they might have completely separated Ireland from the Government of this country." *Speech of Lord Buckingham, June 23*, 1808. Lord Buckingham was at this time Lord Lieutenant: Mr. George Gould, of Cork, was the Catholic who lent his money to Government.

parliamentary reform; and upon its being rejected by the convention, knowing that its power was not to be dreaded, if unsupported by the Catholic population, they despised its threats, and, by a manly opposition to their demands, they secured their dispersion without tumult, and certainly without the regret of the advocates of such a reform in Parliament as the general circumstances of the country absolutely required.

From this period, to the year 1790, the Catholic question was not once agitated, either by the Catholics or by Parliament. In this year the Attorney-general brought in a bill to explain and amend the act of 22d Geo. III. c. 62.

The intention of this act was to give to Catholics the power of appointing guardians to their children, but it was so carelessly drawn, that, upon consulting it, in the case of the will of the late Lord Gormanstown, by which he had appointed guardians to his son, it was discovered that they were not competent to act. The present bill was therefore introduced to remedy this defect.

A circumstance, which took place this summer, shows that this act of common justice was not, in any degree, the result of an inclination, on the part of Government, to treat the Catholics with more than customary liberality. Lord Westmoreland, then Lord Lieutenant, had visited the South of Ireland; and, on his arrival at Cork, it was intimated to the Catholics there, that an expression of their loyalty would be acceptable. Accordingly an address of that nature was prepared, which, however, concluded with a *hope*, that their loyalty would entitle them to some relaxation of the penal code. Before its being formally presented, it was submitted to his Excellency, and was returned to them, to strike out the clause which expressed hope. With a feeling rather natural to men not perfectly broken down by oppression, they refused to strike it out, and declined presenting the address.

A century of pains and penalties had now elapsed, in which period the most severe and minute investigation had not been able to ascribe to the Catholics one instance of disloyalty, when they at length determined to make a vigorous exertion to obtain a restoration of their constitutional rights. In the course of the year 1790, violent resolutions had been entered into by the magistrates of the county of Armagh against them. Those of Dublin, and of the other principal cities and towns of Ireland, were in consequence roused to adopt resolutions on their part, expressive of the necessity of petitioning Parliament. These had been transmitted to the general committee of Catholics, who thereupon held a meeting to consider them, on the 11th of February, 1791. The general committee referred these resolutions to a sub-committee, who made upon them the following report:

"Your committee having, in obedience to your directions, carefully perused the resolutions of the Catholics of Ireland, report, that said resolutions contain the most unequivocal sentiments of loyalty to our most gracious Sovereign, George the Third, of love for our country, and obedience to its laws, and the most humble hope of being restored to some participation of its excellent constitution.

"That your Catholic brethren refer, with confidence, to the numberless proofs they have given of fidelity in times the most perilous, when rebellion raged in the bosom of Britain, and when foreign invasion threatened our coast, and to that alacrity with which all descriptions of our people took the oath of allegiance; and they rely that their scrupulous observance of such sacred obligation will no where be doubted, when it is considered, that if they took those oaths required by law, they would thereby become entitled to all the rights of citizens.

"That, with all humility, they confide in the justice, liberality, and wisdom of Parliament, and the benignity of our most gracious Sovereign, to relieve them from their degraded situation, and no longer to suffer them to continue like strangers in their native land; but thus have the glory of showing all Europe, that in the plenitude of power, strength, and riches of the British empire, when nothing they grant can be imputed to any motives but those of justice and toleration; that, at such a period, they deign to hear and relieve their oppressed and faithful subjects, and to unite them for ever to their country, by every tie of gratitude and interest; and that they will show to all Europe, that humble and peaceful conduct, and dutiful application, are the only true and effectual methods for good subjects to obtain relief from a wise and good government.

"That our Catholic brethren therefore desire that application may be made for such relief as the wisdom and justice of Parliament may grant; and they hope to be restored, at least, to some of the rights and privileges which have been wisely granted to others who dissent from the established church; that they may be thus enabled to promote, in conjunction with the rest of their fellow-subjects, the present and future happiness and strength of their country.

"That our said Catholic brethren direct, that such application be immediately made, and continued, in the most submissive and constitutional manner, for a mitigation of the restrictions and disqualifications under which they labor."

The general committee having agreed with and adopted this report, a petition was prepared in order to be laid before Parliament in the ensuing session.

With this petition a deputation of the general committee waited upon the chief secretary, Lord Hobart, to solicit the countenance and protection of Government, but in vain. This was not only refused them, but the Catholics of Ireland, constituting, at the lowest calculation, three-fourths of the inhabitants of the kingdom, had not even sufficient influence to induce any one member of Parliament to present it.

A second deputation having failed to obtain even an answer from Government to a renewed application for its support, it was determined to send Mr. Keogh to London, to lay before his Majesty's Ministers the state of his Catholic subjects.

Mr. Keogh, on his arrival in London, instituted a negociation with Mr. Pitt and the Cabinet: at the close of which, the Catholics were given to understand that they might hope for four objects—grand juries, county magistrates, high sheriffs, and the bar. Admission to the right of suffrage was also mentioned, and taken under consideration.

The spirit of religious liberty having at this time made great progress among the Protestant dissenters in Ulster, the 1st Belfast volunteer company, in July, 1791, passed a resolution in favor of admitting the Catholics to a full enjoyment of the constitution; and, in October, the great Northern Association of United Irishmen[1] pledged themselves "to endeavour, by all due means, to procure a complete and radical reform of the people in Parliament, including Irishmen of every religious persuasion."

In the mean time, whilst Mr. Keogh was in London, the Irish Administration had been endeavouring to counteract the views of the Catholic body, by a negociation with the principal nobility and gentry belonging to it; and, in some degree, their exertions were successful. For, at a meeting of the general committee, held in December, 1791, for the purpose of considering of the policy of petitioning Parliament in the ensuing session, some of the meeting wished to adopt a resolution of seeking no removal of the existing disabilities, but in such a manner and to such an extent as the wisdom of the legislature deemed expedient. This was resisted by others, and on a division upon the question of petitioning, the nobility were left in a minority of 90 to 17.

Pursuant to this decision, the following petition was drawn up, and introduced into the House of Commons, by Mr. O'Hara, on the 23d January, 1792.

We your petitioners, being appointed by sundry of his Majesty's subjects professing the Roman Catholic religion, to be agents for conducting applications to the legislature for their relief, in our own and their names, beg leave to approach this High Court of Parliament with an unfeigned respect for its wisdom and authority; and at the same time, with a deep and heartfelt sensation of our singular and deplorable situation. And, first of all, we implore (and for this we throw ourselves on the indulgence of Parliament) that no irregularity or defect in form or language, should obstruct the success of these our most ardent supplications. The circumstances in which we stand deserve consideration. For near a hundred years, we and our fathers, and our grandfathers, have groaned under a code of laws, (in some parts already purged from the statutes), the like of which, no age, no nation, no climate ever saw. Yet, sore as it were from the scourge of active persecution, scarce yet confirmed in our minds, and but lately secure in our persons and in our houses, from the daily alarms of search-warrants and informers, we come before Parliament for the first time; and we come to ask an alleviation of burdens, under which we can only find consolation in the melancholy comparison of former times. In this state of recent apprehension and troubled anxious hope, with minds unadapted to the precise observances of decorum, we rest upon the simple merits of our case. It is a part of our calamities, that we do not know how to tell them with propriety; and if our complaints should deviate into remonstrance, and we should seem to upbraid, when we mean to supplicate, we trust a due allowance will be made for expressions extorted by our anguish, or proceeding from an inevitable ignorance of form. Excluded from the Constitution in all its parts, and in many respects aliens to the law, how should we have learned the forms of Parliament?

---

[1] It was not till 1794, that a new society, under this name, embarked in an attempt to separate Great Britain and Ireland.

The hardships we suffer proceed from the law. It is, therefore, only to the fountain of the law that we can look for relief. You are the great Council of our Sovereign Lord the King; but you are also subjects like ourselves. The ear of Majesty, by the law of the land, and by the benignity of that Sovereign whom it is your glory to imitate, is ever open to the petitions of his people. As far as we are able to discern the great outlines of a constitution, which we know only in speculation, we conceive that it is the boast of the Constitution of these kingdoms, to have associated a portion of the people into the Sovereign power; in order that, not dazzled by the awe of supreme Majesty, the subject may find a happy mediatorial institution, an asylum wherein to deposit the burden of his griefs, to expose the nakedness of his oppressions, and indulge complaint even to exaggeration. There were, indeed, those who would have made us believe, that Parliament was only to be approached with circumspect and timid steps; at most, in general terms; and that, wrapped in proud and inexorable state, you would consider a specification of the wants of the people as an insult, and a reason for not supplying them. But we knew it could not be. We knew that no senate, no king, no tyrant, had ever professed to turn his ear from detailed supplication. The Majesty of God himself is willing to receive, and demands the incense of particular prayer. And shall we, who speak from man to man, from subject to subject, not dare to specify the measure and extent of our crying necessities. Despising that base and hypocritical affectation, we are sure it is far more congenial to the nature and to the temper of Parliament, with a firm and generous confidence, to say, as we say—here is the evil—there is the remedy: To you we look for relief.

Behold us then before you, three millions of the people of Ireland, subjects of the same king, inhabitants of the same land, bound together by the same social contract, contributing to the same revenues, defended by the same armies, declared, by the authentic words of an act of Parliament, to be good and loyal subjects to his Majesty, his Crown, and Government, and yet doomed to one general unqualified incapacity, and universal exclusion, an universal civil proscription. We are excluded from the state. We are excluded from the revenues. We are excluded from every distinction, every privilege, every office, every emolument, every civil trust, every corporate right. We are excluded from the navy, from the army, from the magistrature, from the professions. We are excluded from the palladium of life, liberty, and property, the juries and inquests of our country.—From what are we not excluded? We are excluded from the constitution. We stand a strange anomaly in the law; not acknowledged, not disavowed; not slaves, not freemen: an exception to the principles of jurisprudence; a prodigy in the system of civil institution. We incur no small part of the penalties of a general outlawry, and a general excommunication. Disability meets us at every hour, and in every walk of life. It cramps our industry, it shackles our property, it depresses our genius, it debilitates our minds.—Why are we disfranchised, and why are we degraded? Or rather, why do theseevils afflict our country, of which we are no inconsiderable part?

We most humbly and earnestly supplicate and implore Parliament to call this law of universal exclusion to a severe account, and now at last to demand of it, upon what principle it stands, of equity, of morality, of justice, or of policy. And, while we request this scrutiny into the law, we demand, also, the severest scrutiny into our principles, our actions, our words, and our thoughts. Wherein have we failed as loyal and affectionate subjects to the best of Sovereigns, or as sober, peaceable, and useful members of society. Where is that people who can offer the testimony of a hundred years patient submission to a code of laws, of which no man living is now an advocate—without sedition, without murmur, without complaint. Our loyalty has undergone a century of severe persecution for the sake of our religion, and we have come out of the ordeal with our religion, and with our loyalty.

Why then are we still left under the ban of our country? We differ, it is true, from the national church, in some points of doctrinal faith. Whether it is our blessing or our misfortune, He only knows to whom all things are known. For this our religion we offer no apology. After ages of learned and critical discussion, we cannot expect to throw farther light upon it. We have only to say, that it is founded on revelation, as well as the religion established by law. Both you and we are regenerated in the same baptism, and profess our belief in the same Christ; you according to the church of England, we according to the church of Rome. We do not exercise an abject or obscure superstition. If we err, our errors have been, and still are, sanctioned by the example of many florishing, learned, and civilised nations. We do not enter, we disdain to enter into the cavils of antiquated sophistry, and to insult the understanding of Parliament by supposing it necessary to prove that a religion is not incompatible with civil government, which has subsisted for so many hundred years under every possible form of government, in some tolerated, in some established, even to this day.

With regard to our civil principles, we are unalterably, deeply, and zealously attached to his Majesty's person and Government. Good and loyal subjects we are, and we are declared by law to be. With regard to the Constitution of the state, we are as much attached to it as it is possible for men to be attached to a constitution by which they are not avowed. With regard to the constitution of the church, we are, indeed, inviolably attached to our own: First, because we believe it to be true; and next, because, beyond belief, we know that its principles are calculated to make us, and have made us, good men and good citizens. But as we find it answers to us, individually, all the useful ends of religion, *we solemnly and conscientiously declare, that we are satisfied with the present condition of our ecclesiastical policy. With satisfaction, we acquiesce in the establishment of the national church; we neither repine at its possessions, nor envy its dignities: we are ready, upon this point, to give every assurance that is binding upon man.*

With regard to every other subject, and to every other calumny, we have no disavowals, we have no declarations to make. Conscious of the innocence of our lives, and the purity of our intentions, we are justified in asking, what reason of state exists, and we deny that any does exist, for leaving us still in the bondage of the law, and under the protracted restriction of penal statutes. Penalties suppose, if not crimes, at least a cause of reasonable suspicion. Criminal imputations like those (for to be adequate to the effect, they must be great indeed) are, to a generous mind, more grievous than the penalties themselves. They incontrovertibly imply, that we are considered by the legislature as standing in a doubtful light of fidelity or loyalty to the King, or to the Constitution of our country, and perhaps to both. While on these unjust suppositions we are deprived of the common rights and privileges of British and of Irish subjects, it is impossible for us to say we are contented while we endure a relentless civil proscription for which no cause is alleged, and for which no reason can be assigned.

Because we now come with a clear, open, and manly voice, to insist upon the grievances under which we still labor, it is not to be inferred that we have forgot the benignant justice of Parliament, which has relieved us from the more oppressive, but not the most extensive part of the penal system. In those days of affliction, when we lay prostrate under the iron rod, and, as it were, entranced in a gulph of persecution, it was necessary for Parliament to go the whole way, and to stretch out a saving hand to relieve us. We had not the courage to look up with hope, to know our condition, or even to conceive a remedy. It is because the former relaxations were not thrown away upon us; it is because we begin to feel the influence of somewhat more equal laws, and to revive from our former inanition, that we now presume to stand erect before you. Conceiving that Parliament has a right to expect, as a test of our gratitude, that we should no longer lie a dead weight upon our country, but come forward in our turn to assist with our voice, our exertions, and our councils, in a work, to which the wisdom and power of Parliament is incompetent without our co-operation—the application of a policy, wholly new, to the pressing wants, and to the intimate necessities of a people long forgotten, out of the sight and out of the knowledge of a superintending legislature.—Accordingly we are come, and we claim no small merit that we have found our way to the door of Parliament. It has not been made easy for us.—Every art and industry has been exerted to obstruct us: attempts have been made to divide us into factions, to throw us into confusion. We have stood firm and united. We have received hints and cautions; obscure intimations and public warnings to guard our supplications against intimidation. We have resisted that species of disguised and awful threat. We have been traduced, calumniated, and libelled. We have witnessed sinister endeavours again to blow the flame of religious animosity, and awake the slumbering spirit of popular terrors and popular fury.—But we have remained unmoved. We are, indeed, accustomed to this tumid agitation and ferment in the public mind. In former times it was the constant precursor of more intense persecution, but it has also attended every later and happier return of legislative mercy. But whether it betokens us evil or good, to Parliament we come, to seek, at that shrine, a safeguard from impending danger, or a communication of new benefits.

What then do we ask of Parliament? To be thoroughly united and made one with the rest of our fellow-subjects. That, alas! would be our first, our dearest wish. But if that is denied us, if sacrifices are to be made, if by an example of rare moderation, we do not aspire to the condition of a fair equality, we are not at a loss to find, in the range of social benefits (which is nearly that of our present exclusions) an object which is, and ought to be, the scope and resting-place of our wishes and our hopes. That which, if we do not ask, we are not worthy to obtain. We knock that it may be opened unto us. We have learned by tradition from our ancestors, we have heard by fame in foreign lands, where we have been driven to seek education in youth, and bread in manhood; and, by the contemplation of our own minds, we are filled with a deep and unalterable opinion that the Irish, formed upon the model of the British Constitution, is a blessing of inestimable value; that it contributes, and is even essentially necessary for national and individual happiness. Of this Constitution we feel ourselves worthy; and though not practically, we know the benefits of its franchises. Nor can we, without a criminal dissimulation, conceal from Parliament the painful inquietude which is felt by our whole persuasion, and the dangers to which we do not cease to be exposed, by this our total and unmerited exclusion from the common rights, privileges, and franchises, conceded by our Kings for the protection of the subject. This exclusion is indeed the root of every evil. It is that which makes property insecure, and industry precarious. It pollutes the stream of justice. It is the cause of daily humiliation. It is the insurmountable barrier, the impassable line of separation which divides the nation, and which, keeping animosity alive, prevents the entire and cordial intermixture of the people. And therefore inevitably it is, that some share, some portion, some participation in the liberties and franchises of our country, becomes the primary and essential object of our ardent and common solicitation. It is a blessing for which there is no price, and can be no compensation. With it, every evil is tolerable; without it, no advantage is desirable. In this, as in all things, we submit ourselves to the paramount authority of Parliament; and we shall acquiesce in what is given, as we do in what is taken away. But this is the boon we ask. We hunger and we thirst for the Constitution of our country. If it shall be deemed otherwise, and shall be determined that we are qualified perhaps for the base and lucrative tenures of professional occupation, but unworthy to perform the free and noble services of the Constitution, we submit, indeed, but we solemnly protest against that distinction for ourselves and for our children. It is no act of ours. Whatever judgment may await our merits or our failings, we cannot conclude ourselves, by recognising, for a consideration, the principle of servility and perpetual degradation.

These are the sentiments which we feel to the bottom of our hearts, and we disclose them to the free Parliament of a Monarch whose glory it is to reign over a free people.—To you we commit our supplications and our cause. We have, indeed, little to apprehend, in this benigner age, from the malignant aspersions of former times, and not more from the obsolete calumnies of former strife; although we see them endeavouring again to collect the remnant of their exhausted venom, before they die for ever, in a last and feeble effort to traduce our religion and our principles. But as oppression is ever fertile in pretexts, we find the objections started against us more dangerous because they are new, or new at least in the novelty of a shameless avowal. They are principally three.—First, it is contended that we are a people originally and fundamentally different from yourselves, and that our interests are for ever irreconcileable, because some hundred years ago our ancestors were conquered by yours. We deny the conclusion: we deny the fact. It is false.—In addressing ourselves to you, we speak to the children of our ancestors, as we also are the children of your forefathers. Nature has triumphed over law; we are intermixed in blood; we are blended in connexion; we are one race; we all are Irishmen; subjects of the Imperial Crown of Ireland. The honor of Parliament is concerned, to repress the audacity of those who tell us that you are a foreign colony; and, consequently, ought to govern according to the principles of invaders, and the policy of recent usurpation. At least we confide that you will not suffer the walls of Parliament to be contaminated with that libel upon the Government of Ireland. The shaft which was aimed at us has struck yourselves; a memorable, but, at the same time, we trust, a most auspicious example, to teach both you and us, and our common posterity, that our interests are one; and that whatever affects the well-being and honor of the Roman Catholics, is also injurious to the Protestant interest. Of the same complexion and tendency are the two objections, one that our advancement in property and privilege would lead to a repeal of the act of settlement; the other, that our participation in the liberties and franchises of our country, would endanger the existence of the Constitution into which we are admitted.

A resumption of the lands forfeited by our and your ancestors, (for they are the same) after the lapse of so many years, (near three returns of the longest period of legal limitation) after the dispersion and extinction of so many families; after so many transitions and divisions, repartitions and reconsolidations of property; so many sales, judgments, mortgages, and settlements; and after all the various process of voluntary and legal operation, to conceive the revival of titles dormant for 150 years, is an idea so perfectly chimerical, so contrary to the experience of all ages and all countries, so repugnant to the principles of jurisprudence, and so utterly impossible in point of fact; that the Roman Catholics of Ireland, once for all, make it their earnest request to have that question thoroughly investigated, in the assured hope, that so idle, vain, and absurd an object of public apprehension, being exposed and laid open to the eye of reason, may sleep in oblivion for ever.

As to the other subject of apprehension, we have but one answer to make. We desire to partake in the Constitution; and therefore we do not desire to destroy it. Parliament is now in possession of our case; our grievances, our sorrows, our obstructions, our solicitudes, our hopes. We have told you the desire of our hearts. We do not ask to be relieved from this or that incapacity; not the abolition of this or that odious distinction; not even perhaps to be in the fulness of time, and in the accomplishment of the great comprehensive scheme of legislation, finally incorporated with you in the enjoyment of the same constitution. Even beyond that mark, we have an ultimate and if possible an object of more interior desire. We look for an union of affections; a gradual, and therefore a total obliteration of all the animosities, (on our part they are long extinct) and all the prejudices which have kept us disjoined. We come to you a great accession to the Protestant interest, with hearts and minds suitable to such an end. We do not come as jealous and suspicious rivals, to gavel the Constitution, but, with fraternal minds, to participate in the great incorporeal inheritance of freedom, to be held according to the laws and customs of the realm, and by our immediate fealty and allegiance to the King. And so may you receive us.

And we shall ever pray.

Objections having been made to this petition, upon Mr. O'Hara's presenting it, as being informal, he withdrew it; and the general committee finding that so bold and explicit a statement of their case had given offence, prepared another petition, merely praying that the House would take into consideration, whether the removal of some of the grievances of the petitioners might not be compatible with Protestant security. This petition was presented by Mr. Egan, on the 18th of February; and on the 20th, was afterwards rejected, on a division of 200 to 23.

On the same day was also rejected a petition from the Protestant inhabitants of Belfast, which went much farther than the petition of the Catholics, as it required that they should be placed on the same footing with their Protestant fellow-subjects.

It was on the 3d January of this year, that Mr. Burke published his letter to Sir Hercules Langrishe, in which he gave that learned and liberal opinion upon the subject of the elective franchise, which, it is said, obtained the royal assent to the measure that afterwards was adopted for conceding it. This letter was admirably well adapted to meet every species of objection, moral, local, and constitutional. It was calculated to remove the prejudices of the Church of England and every sect of Protestant dissenters; and, above all, it was quite conclusive, as a demonstration of the compatibility of Catholic emancipation with the coronation oath.

At a meeting of the general committee, on the 4th February, the following resolutions were agreed to, and afterwards published, with an address to the Protestants, written by Mr. R. Burke, and corrected by his father. To this address were added the answers of the foreign Catholic universities to questions that had been put to them in 1789, at the desire of Mr. Pitt, concerning the existence and extent of the Popish dispensing power.

Resolved, That this committee has been informed that reports have been circulated, that the application of the Catholics for relief, extends to unlimited and total emancipation; and that attempts have been made, wickedly and falsely, to instil into the minds of the Protestants of this kingdom an opinion, that our applications were preferred in a tone of menace.

Resolved, That several Protestant gentlemen have expressed great satisfaction on being individually informed of the real extent and respectful manner of the applications for relief, have assured us, that nothing could have excited jealousy, or apparent opposition to us, from our Protestant countrymen, but the above-mentioned misapprehensions.

Resolved, That we therefore deem it necessary to declare, that the whole of our late applications, whether to his Majesty's Ministers, to men in power, or to private members of the legislature, as well as our intended petition, neither did, nor does contain any thing, or extend further, either in substance or in principle, than the four following objects.

1st. Admission to the profession and practice of the law.

2d. Capacity to serve as county magistracies.

3d. A right to be summoned, and to serve on grand and petty juries.

4th. The right of voting in counties only for Protestant members of Parliament; in such a manner, however, as that a Roman Catholic freeholder should not vote, unless he either rented, and cultivated a farm of twenty pounds per annum, in addition to his forty shillings freehold; or else possessed a freehold to the amount of twenty pounds a-year.

Resolved, That, in our opinion, these applications, not extending to any other objects than the above, are moderate, and absolutely necessary for our general alleviation, and more particularly for the protection of the Catholic farmers and the peasantry of Ireland; and that they do not, in any degree, endanger either church or state, or endanger the security of the Protestant interest.

Resolved, That we never had an idea or thought so extravagant, as that of menacing or intimidating our Protestant brethren, much less the legislature; and that we disclaim the violent and turbulent intentions imputed to us in some of the public prints, and circulated in private conversation.

Resolved, That we refer to the known disposition of the Roman Catholics of this kingdom, to our dutiful behaviour, during a long series of years, and particularly to the whole tenor of our late proceedings, for the full refutation of every charge of sedition and disloyalty.

Resolved, That for the more ample and detailed exposure of all the evil reports and calumnies circulated against us, an address to our Protestant fellow-subjects, and to the public in general, be printed by the order and in the name of the general committee.

The queries and answers concerning the Popish dispensing power, are as follow:

1st. Has the Pope or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, any civil authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence whatsoever, within the realm of England?

2d. Can the Pope or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, absolve or dispense with his Majesty's subjects from their oath of allegiance, upon any pretext whatsoever?

3d. Is there any principle in the tenets of the Catholic faith, by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or other persons differing from them in religious opinions, in any transaction, either of a public or a private nature?

Abstract from the Answer of the Sacred Faculty of Divinity of Paris to the above Queries.

After an introduction according to the usual forms of the university, they answer the first query by declaring:

Neither the *Pope, nor the Cardinals, nor any body of men,* nor any other person of the Church of Rome hath any *civil authority, civil power, civil jurisdiction, or civil pre-eminence* whatsoever, in *any* kingdom; and consequently, none in the kingdom of England, by reason or virtue of any authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence by divine institution inherent in, or granted, or by any other means belonging to the Pope, or the Church of Rome. This doctrine the Sacred Faculty of Divinity of Paris has always held, and upon every occasion maintained, and upon every occasion has rigidly proscribed the contrary doctrines from her schools.

Answer to the second query.—Neither the *Pope, nor the Cardinals, nor any body of men,* nor any person of the Church of Rome, can, by virtue of the keys, absolve or release the subjects of the King of England from their oath of allegiance.

This and the first query are so intimately connected that the answer of the first immediately and naturally applies to the second, &c.

Answer to the third query.—There is no tenet in the Catholic church, by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or those who differ from them in matters of religion. The tenet, that it is lawful to break faith with heretics, is so repugnant to common honesty and the opinions of Catholics, that *there is nothing of which those who have defended the Catholic faith against Protestants have complained more heavily than the malice and calumny of their adversaries in imputing this tenet to them, &c. &c. &c.*

Given at Paris, in the General Assembly of the Sorbonne, held on Thursday the 11th day before the calends of March, 1789.

Signed in due form.

University of Louvain.

The Faculty of Divinity at Louvain having been requested to give her opinion upon the questions above stated, does it with readiness—*but struck with astonishment that such questions should,* *at the end of this eighteenth century, be proposed to any learned body, by inhabitants of a kingdom that glories in the talents and discernment of its natives.* The Faculty being assembled for the above purpose, it is agreed, with the unanimous assent of all voices, to answer the first and second queries absolutely in the negative.

The Faculty does not think it incumbent upon her, in this place, to enter upon the proofs of her opinion, or to show how it is supported by passages in the Holy Scriptures, or the writings of antiquity. That has already been done by Bossuet, De Marca, the two Barclays, Goldastus, the Pithæuses, Argentre Widrington, and his Majesty King James the First, in his Dissertation against Bellarmine and Du Perron, and by many others, &c. &c. &c.

The Faculty then proceeds to declare, that the sovereign power of the state is in nowise (not even indirectly, as it is termed) subject to, or dependent upon any other power; though it be a spiritual power, or even though it be instituted for eternal salvation, &c. &c.

That *no man, nor any assembly of men*, however eminent in dignity and power, nor even the *whole body of the Catholic church*, though assembled in general council, can, upon any ground of pretence whatsoever, weaken the bond of union between the Sovereign and the people; still less can they absolve or free the subjects from their oath of allegiance.

Proceeding to the third question, the said Faculty of Divinity *(in perfect wonder that such a question should be proposed to her)* most positively and unequivocally answers, that there is not, and there never has been, among the Catholics, or in the doctrines of the Church of Rome, any law or principle whch makes it lawful for Catholics to break their faith with heretics, or others of a different persuasion from themselves, in matters of religion, either in public or private concerns.

The Faculty declares the doctrine of the Catholics to be, that the divine and natural law, which makes it a duty to keep faith and promises, is the same; and is neither shaken nor diminished, if those, with whom the engagement is made, hold erroneous opinions in matters of religion, &c. &c.

Signed in due form on the 18th of November, 1788.

WHAT ARE RICHES?

OR,

AN EXAMINATION

OF THE DEFINITIONS

OF THIS SUBJECT

GIVEN BY MODERN ECONOMISTS.

BY SIR EGERTON BRYDGES, BART.

GENEVA:
PRINTED BY W. FICK.
AUGUST,—1821.

LONDON:—1822.

WHAT ARE RICHES?

&c. &c.

The *Definition* of Riches may have seemed to those, who have not studied the subject, to be a much easier thing, than it is!

On the 6th day of September, 1819—a date which, for a reason that will presently appear, the reader is particularly requested to attend to, I published in a *Tract on Population and Riches*, (printed at Geneva) the following Definition on this subject:

"Riches are such *material* things, as have a *value in exchange* either with other material things, or with such immaterial things, as gratify the wants, conveniences, or amusements of man."

I added in a note:

"It seems to me that Adam Smith's omission of this word *material* has led Garnier, Say, and others, into inextricable confusion and errors about *immaterial* Riches, and *productive* and *nonproductive labor*.

"I contend that to entitle that which is produced to belong to the class of Riches, it must have something of substance, of which the producer, when he transfers it, loses the property; and which is of a nature to be capable of being re-exchanged or retransferred. It may be consumed as soon as produced, either by the producer, or by him who takes it in exchange; but it must have the capacity of some duration, and of being exchangeable and re-exchangeable."

In the following year, 1820, Mr. Malthus published his great work on The Principles of Political Economy. His *Introduction* is dated from Hertford College, 1 Dec. 1819. He commences with a definition of Riches, in which he also confines them to objects *material*.

But in another important point even his definition is defectively worded.

Lord LAUDERDALE defines RICHES to be:

"Every thing necessary, useful, or agreeable to man."

M. SAY defines them to be:

"Every thing that *can procure* whatever is necessary, useful, or agreeable to man."

Mr. MALTHUS defines them to be:

"Such *material* objects as are necessary, useful, or agreeable to man."

All these definitions are mainly defective.

Lord LAUDERDALE omits both the materiality, and the power of procuring.

M. SAY omits the materiality.

Mr. MALTHUS omits the power of procuring.

Supply these defects, and the definition may be made perfect, thus:

"RICHES are such material objects as have the power of procuring whatever is necessary, useful, or agreeable to man."

The *indefinite* latitude of Lord LAUDERDALE's *(miscalled)* definition is apparent to all.

The latitude of M. SAY's definition is sufficient to destroy all the distinctions on which depends a clear knowledge of the causes of the increase or decrease of RICHES. It involves a series of confusions, which meet us at every step; and rests its support on innumerable subtleties, of which I can scarcely name another example.

Mr. MALTHUS's defectiveness is confined to his definition. His whole *doctrine* entirely agrees with the *corrected* definition which I have supplied. It is singular, that he should have fallen into an omissiveness similar to that which he has blamed in Adam Smith. Smith's doctrine was right: but he omitted the word *material* in his definition. So Malthus has omitted to *name* the ingredient of *procurability*, or *exchangeable value*.

SAY's error is not a mere defect in wording his definition. It pervades all his theory, and is its corner-stone. It lets in what he calls *Immaterial* RICHES; and on this he prides himself.

It is not my present purpose to pursue this, which I contend to be a most important error, into all its consequences. It may be at this moment sufficient to say only enough to show its nature.

In assuming whatever will *procure* RICHES, *to be* RICHES:

1. There is a confusion between the *means* and the *end*.

2. A confusion between the *posse* and the *esse*.

3. A confusion between exchangeability and identity of kind.

One might have expected, that the words *Immaterial Riches* would have struck every one as a contradiction in terms. RICHES in the universal opinion, as testified by the word synonymously applied to them, mean something of *substance.*

If they have no substance, how can they be appropriated? how can they circulate? how can they be transferred from one to another? how can they accumulate? how can they be detached from the person of the originator?

Yet surely that which is *deficient* in *any one* of these qualities, cannot be Riches.

Those things, which M. Say calls *Immaterial Riches*, are deficient in them all.

Immaterial things may procure Riches, and Riches may procure *immaterial* things; but they are not therefore *the same.*

Nor is even every *material* thing which is necessary, useful, or agreeable, Riches; because it must also have a *value in exchange;* and it cannot have a value in exchange unless it be an object in which a *property* can be had: for no one will give any thing in exchange for that which he can have for nothing; as (speaking generally) he may have water, and some other productions of Nature.—(It is to this point that the defect in the wording of Mr. Malthus's definition refers.)

Riches then are such material objects whether of Nature only, or improved by human[1] labor, as have a value in exchange, compounded of their necessity, usefulness, or amusement to man; and of the right of property in them.

If this definition be just, we come at once to the test of the soundness and accuracy of Adam Smith's grand distinction of *productive* and *unproductive labor*, (with reference to Riches).

No labor *can* be *productive*, except of things which come within this definition.

But no one can deny, that there is an incalculable quantity of human labor, bodily and intellectual, which neither produces, nor can produce, such things. This last then is *unproductive* labor: domestic servants, soldiers, sailors, all the liberal professions, are occupied in *unproductive* labor.

When we understand precisely what this *unproductive labor* is, we can judge with much greater facility and certainty, in what cases and to what extent it is desirable, and in what cases and to what extent it is not.

For let it be recollected, that Riches are not *always* best expended in procuring Riches: they may sometimes be expended in procuring what is far more useful or desirable. For as other things, which are the means of Riches, must not be confounded with Riches themselves; so RICHES themselves are but the means of something higher, of which *happiness* is the *end*.

---

[1] It may be doubted if any thing can be comprehended in this which does not require the addition of some human labor. The very act of making the right of property available involves human labor.

Nothing can be more important than this distinction. Without it, it is impossible to comprehend the nature and causes of the distress under which Great Britain has long been suffering, and still suffers. With it, we may have a clear conception of the disease; and if we will, may apply a remedy.

When M. Say asserts that *products* can only be bought by *products*, he means *products* in his own sense, including what he calls *immaterial* RICHES:—and when he asserts that there exists *abundance* of *products*, and therefore that means of purchase cannot be wanting, and that such want cannot be the cause of the present stagnation, he means *products* in the sense of Malthus; viz. *material commodities*.

But employed labor, as far as regards what Smith, Malthus, &c. call *unproductive* labor, *is* wanting: therefore the means of purchasing the goods, which overload the warehouses, are *wanting*. And this again throws *productive* labor out of employ, because there is no demand for it.

Here then is a point, at which *productive* and *unproductive* labor become disproportionate to each other in the market. And *here* it becomes evident how necessary they *both* are in their due proportions; and how incalculably important it is, therefore, to distinguish them precisely from each other.

It is clear, that in proportion to the excess of produce above its cost, will be the means of accumulation; and in proportion to the means of accumulation, a nation has the means of augmenting its RICHES: in proportion to the same excess of produce above cost, it has also the means of consumption. To decide soundly between the one and the other, as circumstances vary, is the great trial of wisdom in Political Economy.

What is the advantage of accumulation, but a greater future good at the expense of a minor present sacrifice? What is the advantage of RICHES, but to spend them at the moment when they can be spent with the greatest benefit? Do we not therefore mistake the means, or the supposed means, for the end, when we economise at unseasonable times?

There appear to be at least three cases, in which there is a great limit to the wisdom of accumulation, or saving.

The first is, where a nation is arrived at such a degree of RICHES, and such a facility of increasing them, that a diminution of expenditure for the purposes of economy, or even a refusal of a proportionate increase of such expenditure, would be a vain and idle forbearance.

The second is, where great and necessary wars render a stop to accumulation, or to the same degree of accumulation, or even a sacrifice of part of the existing capital, indispensable.

The third is, where the whole labor, the whole machinery, and the whole products, having been swelled out in proportion to this increased expenditure, no future good to be derived from accumulation can equal the frightful distresses arising from a great and violent curtailment of the same cost and consumption; and where, as an additional objection, even if the pecuniary gain were worth the price, a pecuniary loss, instead of gain, would ensue. We all know, that in private affairs, a cessation of expense is very often false economy. Where buildings have been erected; where lands have been highly cultivated; where capital has been hazarded, and must be lost, unless it is nurtured to the time of its fructification, there it is a false economy to withhold the continuance of the cost which is necessary to carry them forward.

Nothing can be more demonstrative, than that the expenses of the late wars re-created themselves. The evil was, not in the destruction of capital; but in this incident to public loans, that one set of people, (the already rich,) pay a large portion of the interest of that, of which another set receive the benefit; by which means the property of a country too violently changes hands.

A continuation of loans therefore would be a good, were it not for this counterbalancing incident. But though loans are so far mainly objectionable, yet it may be confidently asserted, that there are numerous diminutions of expense by saving, which are false economy. They are the aggravation of the very life of the disease.

Now let us consider how Great Britain has been lately circumstanced. A war of unexampled expenditure created an unexampled demand both for *productive* and *unproductive* labor. The increased produce arising from capital, machinery, industry, and extended commerce, kept pace with the augmentation of consumption caused by the unprecedented increase of *unproductive* laborers. All the additional apparatus therefore, and all the additional population equal to the new demand, had been completely developed in three and twenty years.

Whether this was a good, or an evil; whether less production, less population, and less Riches, would have been a better thing; and whether (good or bad) it could no longer have been avoided, was now no longer the question:—the machinery, the vested capital, the produce, the population, existed. The question was, how to enable them to go on, with the *least* balance of evil.

To me it is one of those questions which leaves not the smallest particle of doubt in the mind. I should say; " Go on with a liberal expenditure. The population thus excited into being, thus grown into their several habits and qualifications by the public demand, *must* be supported. Do not throw those, who have hitherto lived upon the *capital* of the public purse, a burden upon the *income* of individuals, by throwing them on the *Poor-rates*. Do not think, that by putting lands out of cultivation, by rendering machinery useless, by sinking irredeemably capital, which has been generously ventured, by plunging into bankruptcy and despondence men of skill and enterprise, who have deserved well of the public; do not think, that when you are making a population discontented and desperate, you are saving money by diminishing your expenditure; or that if you could save it, it would be any otherwise than miserably saved.

" Reduce gradually and cautiously; employ part of your disbanded army and navy in public works; in roads and canals:—not in labor *immediately productive;* for that is the disease; but in labor which may facilitate *future* production; a mode of expenditure which will have the good effects of saving without its evils."

I should have said: " The present is a moment doubly unpropitious to a great and sudden decrease of expenditure, because the power of expenditure has been already greatly decreased in a rich and powerful class, by accidental circumstances, either of seasons, or mismanagement. The agriculturists, whose expenditure supported so many laborers, and took off so much manufactured produce, are already, by the fall of corn in 1814 and 1815, shorn, perhaps, of one half[1] of their incomes. Do not aggravate distresses already frightful."

I should have said: " Listen not to the clamors of those, whose business it is to find fault. You will not even avoid their censures by yielding to their objections. They will reproach you either way! But how much more, when misfortune attends your measures, even though they should be those of their own suggestion. If success cannot soothe them, will failure satisfy them with you?"

I hear the answer to this: " The ministers of a mixed government, like that of Great Britain, cannot act independent of popular prejudices and popular clamor. The good of public saving is inseparable from popular opinion,—especially when it keeps off taxes,—and this ideal good is more than doubled by the supposition that it diminishes the power of Government."

This is true: but much might yet be done to enlighten the public mind; and the mind of all, but party, is still capable of receiving rays of light. But where do we hear or see an attempt to put things in a true light, except from the profound and inestimable pen of MALTHUS?

---

[1] Nothing can be more absurd, than the argument, that the expenses of cultivation decreased proportionably. One consideration alone (out of many) puts an end to this argument. A great part of Agriculture and Trade is carried on with *borrowed* capital. Fall of prices did not reduce interest of money.

Numerous other important questions are involved in this doctrine of the necessity of a due proportion between *productive* and *unproductive* labor: Among the rest, the question of MACHINERY. It may be said, that when the producers are too numerous for the non-producers, why defend that which facilitates production? I answer, that to facilitate production by decrease of cost, proportionably facilitates demand, by decrease of price. If it does not do this, it must be admitted that it increases the evil of over-produce.

It is clear, that what adds to the demand at least in proportion to the addition to the supply, cannot be an evil in a case where the grievance is *want* of demand. At the same time, it is clear that price, *high* with respect to *costs*, and at the same time *low* in itself, is the most favorable to prosperity and riches; because it is at the same time a stimulant to the producer, and a benefit to the consumer. And this must be the reason why the amount of the riches of a country, taken on a large scale, is tolerably expressed, when reckoned by their *money-price*. For though one article may increase in price compared with another, when some *accident* diminishes its quantity compared with its usual proportion to that other, yet on the whole, increased production with decreased price will be counterbalanced in the total amount of price by increased demand and consumption.[1]

---

[1] Let it be recollected, that money-price, and intrinsic value, must never be confounded. The *money-price* is the measure of the *value* of things in their artificial character of *Riches*—compounded of all the necessary qualities coming under that definition. *Intrinsic value* is neither measured by cost, nor limited to what is transferable, (or the quantum of other things it can acquire in exchange,) or the power of acquiring other things in exchange at all, &c.

When therefore Mr. Ricardo mentions the case of 2000 pair of stockings, made by machinery at the cost at which 1000 pair only were made before, and says the money-price, in such case, of the 2000 pair, does not exceed the former money-price of the 1000 pair, yet the national gain in what is useful is double in that article, it seems as if he wished to raise the idea that the money-price was no measure of the value of which it professed to be a measure. But what does this prove? that the money-price is not the measure of *intrinsic* value, which it does not profess to be—but that it *is* the measure of that *value* which comes under the name of RICHES: viz. the value of a commodity, according to the quantum of other things it can procure, of a similar value, measured by a compound of the respective costs and demands.

PRICE.

If the definition I have given enables us by a precise conception of the nature of RICHES, to distinguish between *productive* and *unproductive* labor, it enables us with equal precision, not only to know of what RICHES consist, but to measure their comparative quantities and values. It shews us, that PRICE EXPRESSED IN MONEY is that measure.

How that PRICE is regulated, has been in some degree anticipated. Its base is the cost of the production, including capital, interest, and labor bodily and intellectual.

All beyond this, and which constitutes *profit*, is formed of more complicated and varying considerations. It arises from the proportion between *supply* and *demand*.

PRICE cannot long continue below the costs, including moderate and average profits, because without these production would cease.

But PRICE may long continue above cost, and give great partial profits, so long as the amount of the supply, from whatever insurmountable difficulties in reaching that amount, is kept below the demand.

Under this head come the high profits from fertile soils, in the shape of rent; and the high profits from partial machinery, monopolised under the security of a patent.

PROFITS.

PROFITS then are the excess of PRICE above COST. On this subject some of the fashionable modern economists seem to labor under great errors. They assume these PROFITS to be fixed; or rather to be regulated by a fixed rule of excess above a given cost; from whence they draw the conclusion, that an increase of that cost in wages,[1] or otherwise, is to such amount a deduction from PROFIT.

But PROFIT is governed by *demand*, which depends on the comparative want, combined with the comparative means, of purchase. PROFITS therefore and *wages* may, and generally do, increase at the same time.

For the same reason PROFIT may fall below the standard, and *wages* may do the same. The former may, for a time, entirely cease, and be followed by loss.

Misconceptions on the subject of PROFIT are among the most mischievous which can occur in this science. PROFIT gives the spring to industry and enterprise. Damp the hope of this, and you deaden the agricultural, manufacturing and commercial energies of a nation.

---

[1] I confess that the authority of Ricardo, &c. seduced me into this error in my *Tract on Population and Riches*.

The supposition that the Profits—at least the excessive Profits—of *one*, are generally constituted of the loss of *another*, is totally unfounded. In an exchange between two manufacturers on equal terms, each gains, because each can manufacture cheapest in his own art. If the terms be unequal, owing to accidental deficiency of supply, or excess of want, on one side the Profits may be unequal; but the value received is equal: for the measure of value, so far as regards Riches, is Price. What is gained therefore by one, is not lost by the other; for the other receives an equivalent in value for that which he parts with.

EXCESS OF PRODUCTION.

According to the theory of M. Say, there can be no Excess of Production, because he assumes that produce is always exchangeable for produce. But produce is not always exchangeable for produce, or for money, its representative. If one sort of produce exceed its due proportion to another; or exceed the wants it is intended to meet, it ceases to be exchangeable; it over-loads the market.

But it is not only from the failure of a due apportionment of one class of producers to another, that this Excess may arise. M. Say forgets that a large portion of produce is brought forth to supply the demands of *Non-producers:* and that if the means of these Non-producers are withdrawn, to that amount there may be an Excess of Produce in the market: or in other words, a want of sufficiency of that for which produce is exchangeable.

It is not therefore merely the existence of abundant produce and abundant money, in a country, which will furnish sufficiently the demands of a market.. It is the apportionment of that *produce* and that *money*.

ON SOME OPINIONS OF M. SAY.

I should now proceed to discuss this subject of the *apportionment* of *products* and *money;* but that it is necessary to clear my way in some degree by examining some opinions and reasonings of M. Say. This celebrated Economist, as he differs essentially from the definition I have given of Riches, for the same reason is at equal variance as to what ought to be comprehended under the term *Products*. What he calls *Immaterial Riches*, viz. the services which Adam Smith and his school call *unproductive*, M. Say includes under the name of *products*.

"Permettez-moi," he says in Lettre I. à Mr. Malthus, p. 26, "de remarquer en premier lieu que je n'ai pas dit que les marchandises (commodities) s'échangeassent toujours contre des marchandises, mais bien que les produits ne s'achètent qu'avec des produits."

Again, p. 46: "Les marchandises, dites-vous, ne s'échangent pas seulement contre des marchandises : elles s'échangent aussi contre du travail. Si ce travail est un produit que les uns vendent, que les autres achètent, et que ces derniers consomment, il m'en coûtera peu de l'appeler une marchandise, et il ne vous en coûtera pas beaucoup plus d'assimiler les autres marchandises àcelle-là ; car elles sont des produits aussi. Les confondant alors les unes et les autres sous le nom générique de produits, vous pourrez convenir peut-être qu'on n'achète des produits qu'avec des produits."

But if this absurdly-enlarged sense of PRODUCTS were correct, and M. SAY could thus establish that *products* can be exchanged for nothing else but *products*, the conclusion does not follow which he wishes to draw,—that *products* will *always* exchange for *products ;* viz. *that one kind of product can always find an exchange for another kind.* If he does not make out this, he fails in the purpose for which this position is brought forward: for it is his object to show, that our late distresses could not have been the effect of *superabundance*, because he argues that the more that products are multiplied, the greater are the means, and the greater the facilities of exchange.

ON THE APPORTIONMENT OF PRODUCTS.

Whatever be the means by which *products* are purchased (and it is clear that they may be purchased as well by what ADAM SMITH calls *unproductive* services, as by actual products), it is obvious that superfluity and deficiency must depend not merely on the positive amount of the whole products and the whole means ; but on the *apportionment* of the *parts* and *several sorts*, both of produce and of means.

The products must be adapted and assorted to the wants of the market, and to the classes of purchasers who have the means of buying.

Now what can be more plain than this, that if a certain large portion of manufactured commodities has been hitherto demanded and consumed by half a million unproductive laborers, who are all at once dismissed from employment, this manufactured amount must glut the market, and cause the dismissal of an equal number of manufacturers? and thus continue to act and re-act upon the whole community.

If it be said that the manufacturers may apply themselves to another species of produce adapted to the altered demands of the market, it may happen either that no new demand starts up in lieu of that which has ceased; or that the former machinery, and skill of the former workmen, are unfitted to supply it.

The quantity of *producers* in a state of society in which industry aided by the greatest artificial means has arrived at a vastly increased production, continues unproportionally to augment in certain channels beyond the *consumers*.

This has been exhibited by the extraordinary impulse and activity given to labor, capital and skill in the last thirty years in Great Britain, to a degree which Adam Smith could not probably have imagined; and which, if he could have foreseen it, would have induced him to have qualified his exclusive commendations of *productive labor*.

ON THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PRODUCTS AND MONEY.

It seems to me that Say errs, not only in giving infinitely too extended a sense to the term *products*, but that he participates in a much more common error, by confounding Money with the *other* Products, which, as all agree, constitute Riches.

There are two respects, wherein Money, in its character of *coin*, possesses a most important difference from other Products.

First, that it is exclusively received, not on account of the use or pleasure it can administer in right of itself; but for the purpose of procuring something else: that is, merely as an instrument of exchange.

Secondly, that (taking *Riches* according to the definition I have given) it is a much more perfect species of *Riches* than any other: for it has not only a more *fixed* value in exchange than any other product—but *it is* always *exchangeable*. This can scarcely be said strictly of *any other* Product.

Money then, after all, is the test of exchangeability. Whenever those products, or services, which at another time exchange for Money, cease to be *so* exchangeable, or are only exchangeable for a lower and unremunerating price, it is a proof that there is a superfluity of them. Whichever party in the desired exchange cannot command Money[1] (or that which is immediately exchangeable for Money) offers that, which is proved by this test, to be superabundant.

---

[1] But it must not be inferred from hence, that *every thing*, when it can command *money*, such as *labor*, is then and therefore *riches*. The money is riches, as soon as received, to him who has earned it; but the labor is not therefore riches to him to whom that labor is given in exchange. The quality possessed in common by the things mutually transferred, is *exchangeability*: but exchangeability is only *one* quality of *riches*.

This is a simple clue, by which to judge of the soundness of SAY's reasonings. He uses essential words in so loose and unlimited a sense in his *first letter to Malthus*, that they mean every thing, and nothing; and throughout he is so confused, inconsistent, and contradictory, that it is impossible to pursue his errations.

Whatever product ceases to be exchangeable for *money*, because it is superfluous, ceases to be *Riches;* whether the superfluity arises from want of means, or want of will to acquire it.

ON PRODUCTIVE AND UNPRODUCTIVE LABOR.

Sound and clear as is the distinction between PRODUCTIVE and UNPRODUCTIVE LABOR made by Adam Smith, whatever may be the attempts of the new school to shake it, yet the *spirit* of its very principle instructs us to refrain from carrying it to the literal extent, to which many indiscriminate followers of this master of the science are inclined to push it.

By *productive* labor is meant labor *productive of Riches.* There is a *point* of multiplication *beyond* which production *ceases* to be *Riches:*[1] for to be Riches, it must have an *exchangeable* or *marketable* value: but when it is brought forth in quantities unproportionally large, no demand for this excess can be found; either because there is no want of it, or because they, who want it, have no means to pay for it.

A disregard of this most important distinction has led many writers and many debaters on this subject into opinions, which every day's experience, as well as all solid reasoning, refutes. Mere quantity of production, whether from fertility of soil, or from human industry, does not constitute *Riches.* That augmentation, which forms *a glut of the market*, is not only not a gain; it is *a loss.*

ON THE THINGS DENOMINATED IMMATERIAL RICHES BY M. SAY.

If M. SAY had called the *unproductive* services and other things to which he gives the title of IMMATERIAL RICHES,[2] *one portion*

---

[1] The practical truth of this must be familiar to the public, on the smallest consideration.

When commodities come first into the trader's warehouse from the manufacturer, they are estimated at a value, of which the measure is the market price. What remains in the warehouse after the demands of the market are satisfied, becomes of little more value than waste.

[2] M. SAY is so far from yielding to Malthus's objection to his *Immaterial Riches*, that the objection stimulates him to an infinite extension, instead of retraction, of this doctrine. He is no longer content with a *portion* of *Immaterial Riches:* he insists that *all* Riches are *Immaterial!!* His reasoning on this point is curious. He says, that Man cannot add an atom to *matter:* he can only decompose, and recompose it! He then asserts, that

of the means or stimulant of Riches by adding to the funds applicable to the *exchange* with *Riches*, his classification would have been both just and useful. But there is still less identity between *Riches* and the *means of Riches*, than there is between *Riches* and the *Ingredient of Riches*. In the latter case, who would say that the bricks, the stones, the tiles, the timber, of which a building consists, are *therefore themselves* a building?

I agree with M. Say, that a large portion of the things thus named by him, are greatly *contributory* to Riches. I am firmly persuaded, that they are *contributory*, when those things which, as soon as they are increased unproportionally, and exceed a certain point, are improperly called *productive*, *cease* to be *contributory*.

Yet they are *only* indirectly contributory: they do not form *part* of the *production itself*; they only assist in directing the means of exchange into more advantageous channels.

But (as Malthus says of Lord Lauderdale's definition of Riches) an investigation of the nature and causes of all sorts of Riches [1] would pass the bounds of a single science. Still, among these causes, that of *Unproductive Labor* in a nation where agricultural and manufacturing riches have been raised to a great abundance, requires a new examination far more profound than it has yet received.

Malthus, uniting the most temperate investigation with the most enlightened views, seems to see this subject in its true colors.[2] But the present crisis of Europe, and especially of Great Britain, demands for it a developement yet unattempted.

I am myself prepared to apply it to the *Poor Laws*, in a way which seems to me the only probable remedy, or palliation, of that ruinous system: but as it will take the space, time, and laborious digestion of a volume, I forbear to give an imperfect anticipation of it in these brief observations.

So long as the public will mistake *means* for *ends*: so long as they will believe that Riches are valuable for themselves, and not for an ulterior object; so long as they will act as if endless accumulation were preferable to refined and innocent enjoyment, so

---

the result and end of this change of form is *utility*: but, (he continues) *utility* is an *immaterial* quality; *therefore* Riches are *immaterial*!!!

I can distinguish between *material* and *immaterial* labor. Labor of both kinds may be *productive*; and of both kinds *unproductive*. But Labor is not *Riches*: it is only an ingredient of *Riches*; and that only when taking a particular direction, and applied to certain objects.

[1] Or rather he should have said, *of all that is useful, or agreeable to human nature*.

[2] M. Sismondi's opinions appear to be the same as I have here advocated, on this topic of primary interest.

long will they mistake the road to the very object they have in view.

Till there is an annual surplus of capital, beyond the income *necessary* for annual consumption, and beyond also what is farther *necessary* to be applied to the purposes of reproduction, *unproductive* services are not merely a loss, but an injury to the *due* nurture of RICHES. But when they arrive at that point, the character of their value is greatly altered. By causing a more beneficial distribution of this existing surplus, they furnish a market for produce, that would otherwise be excessive, instead of adding to that excess.

There can be no doubt, that the end of wealth is, first to supply *necessities;* and, secondly, *luxuries.* It can never be said to be abundant, or even sufficient, till it is adequate to the last effect. Such intellectual services as are directed merely to intellectual production, the arts, which gratify at once the senses and the mind, are objects, which it is the business of the highest stage of Riches to support and foster. But gratifications much less refined and praise-worthy than these are still among the proper ends of Riches. Furniture, equipages, domestic servants, and all the apparatus of splendid or convenient establishments, are among the modes in which the distribution of great wealth is not only desirable, but *requisite* to retain it at its height.

I do not therefore complain of M. SAY for dwelling on these things as very important to the subject he was discussing, and mainly connected with RICHES; but because he indentifies them with RICHES themselves.

ON THE MODES OF ACCUMULATION.

If the reasoning hitherto produced be just, it is the **MODE OF ACCUMULATION** rather than *Accumulation itself* that is objectionable, inasmuch as it argued not to answer its purpose. But I must confess that grave and powerful evils are incident to the *only mode of accumulation* which appears to me to be compatible with the present vastly augmented agricultural and manufactured produce, and vastly augmented amount both of *productive* and *unproductive* population.

The demanded extent of annual expenditure can only be kept up by an increased consumption of capital, viz. in the language commonly made use of, *by living in part upon the principal.* And this can only be done by loans and taxation. Now, though I do not doubt that there is a *reproduction* in this case more than equal to the consumption, the reproduction comes into *different hands;* and therefore causes a frightful change of property.

Statesmen must choose between this evil, and that of the agricultural and manufacturing population out of employ; and the consequent depression and distress of landed and commercial capital.

ON THE PRESENT AGRICULTURAL AND COMMERCIAL DISTRESSES.

I say, that our present DISTRESSES arise from a want of employment of the *Non-productive Laborers,* caused both by our diminished expenditure and the altered channels of our expenditure; and by the decreased employment of *Productive Laborers* arising from the decreased means of the *Non-productive*.

All the other commonly-assigned causes are quite inadequate to the effects which we have witnessed. The causes most generally dwelt upon are taxation, altered value of currency, and increased production.

That taxation could not be the cause is clear, because price and prosperity of agriculture, manufactures, and commerce, continued to increase during the whole period that taxation went on at a rapid progress.

The utmost and most exaggerated result of *altered value of currency* would have been a reduction in price of 20 per cent., at which price the demand would have been equally brisk.

That there has been no *increased production* either of agricultural or manufactured commodities, since the termination of the war—but on the contrary, a great diminution—cannot be questioned.

But when there came a diminution of expenditure of at least 40 millions a year, which had hitherto been paid among the army and navy, and other costs of war, then the demands in the corn-market[1] and manufacture-market were curtailed to an amount, which bore no inconsiderable proportion to that sum.

Either then an expenditure equal to the employment of the first of these classes (the non-productive), which will bring with it the employment of the second, must be resorted to; or this unemployed population must remain not only a burden, instead of a benefit, but a new burden upon an expenditure diminished two-fifths.

The only other alternative, which my mind presents to me is colonisation, if that be practicable, which it probably is not. But colonisation, though practicable, would still be a very qualified remedy. Much land must be thrown out of tillage to reduce the produce to the decreased demand; and much capital vested in machinery and buildings must be sunk; while the augmented debt pressing on diminished production must be grievously aggravated in its proportional weight.

---

[1] I am aware that in the *Agricultural Report (June* 1821,) the demand and consumption of corn is argued to remain the same, except so far as plentiful means encourage *waste*—which is there stated to be very trifling in its effect;—a position very strange to my apprehension. I know, that the *unemployed* must still be *fed*; but surely in a measure vastly *stinted*.

Whether it be possible that this extra expenditure, which has ceased with government, should by degrees find its due distribution under the management of individuals, is a question very difficult to be resolved.

What supplied loans during the war was undoubtedly the superlucration of individuals during that period. The same degree of superlucration can scarcely take place during our present distresses. What does take place, may perhaps be forced into the desirable channels, or at least more desirable than those in which they now flow. Still there must be a diminution of quantity, as well as deterioration of direction.

It is supposed that things, if left to themselves, will gradually by their own attractions, arrange themselves properly. They will unquestionably make many efforts that way, and do something for themselves. I think it is the spirit of the leaders of modern legislation to trust a little too much to this tendency of things to right themselves.

If, as I contend, the cause of the ruling disease be demonstrative, and that it consists in the want of employment of the non-productive laborers, the remedy does not seem beyond the reach of human wisdom. And is it very prudent in such a case to leave things to the slow and uncertain operation of their own cure?

It is perhaps the rage to employ capital *profitably*, which is the present hindrance to the due distribution of it. It arises out of the character, in some degree temporary, of the nation. The largest proportion of the income of the people has, of late years, been rather derived from the *profits* of capital, than from its rent or interest. This largest class therefore cannot easily be brought to expend capital, except with a view to profits. A national and superintending direction appears requisite.

Here is the difficulty. An expenditure at the public command, and through public organs, is that to which it would not be very easy to reconcile the people. War effected this: the superlucrations, then applied to loans, issued out again through the public organs: now they are[1] directed with reference to results of profit.

---

[1] Upon this intricate subject of superlucration, compared with diminution

As the independent capitalist, who derives no part of his fund from *profits*, augments in his power of expenditure, the present circumstances of the nation are more likely to receive benefit, than from the augmented power of the classes, whose funds are wholly or partly derived from profits. Should money therefore become more easily at the command of this description of capitalist, he may injure himself by a stronger temptation to infringe upon his capital; but he will be more useful to the public prosperity. It is possible then that things may not only work their own recovery gradually, but by a more rapid gradation than has been suspected. Produce may diminish with diminution of profits; and the capital hitherto employed in reproduction, may now come into the market, furnishing demand for the remainder. The benefits of superlucration, though slower than in the war, may, as it becomes by degrees more powerful, be, under this check, operative in the proper channels, and so far decrease the evils now felt, as to make them at least tolerable.

ON THE PRINCIPLE OF DEMAND AND SUPPLY, WITH REFERENCE TO UNPRODUCTIVE LABOR.

As Products become Riches only in proportion as the demand somewhat more than keeps pace with the supply, so only in the same proportion of demand for it, does *Unproductive Labor* operate among the *means* of Riches. If it be superabundant, it is a burden upon Riches, not an instrument of its augmentation.

This is precisely the state of circumstances in which the war has left us. It shows the danger of an highly artificial state; of an excessive temporary stimulus. An highly artificial state can seldom be long continued, but by the continuance of a concurrence of causes, which is against all probability. But when we know where the disease lies, we may palliate, if we cannot cure it. It may show the absurdity

---

of capital, many doubts and perplexities remain, which yet keep the mind in waver between opposing data.

The produce of the taxes of Great Britain in 1820, exceeded the produce of the taxes in 1819, by £3,318,141. This increase was upon almost all the principal articles of domestic consumption. Is not this conclusive evidence, that the national income had increased in the same proportion? For it cannot be conceived that the increase was paid for by capital.

Yet no one can doubt that there was at this time a very general distress, not only among the non-productive laborers, but among the productive classes.

The income therefore, that was wanting to some classes, was accumulated upon others.

Still the problem remains to be solved, how when it got into masses, it could distribute itself among those various articles of consumption, from which taxation draws its funds?

of flying directly from extreme stimulants to extreme exhaustures. It shows also, that all those unproductive services, which add not only to the ornament and luxury, but to the intellectual improvement of life, are often as useful in the distribution and even growth of Riches, as those which are so much boasted as alone solid and valuable.

The Noble, who spends his income, or his Capital, in a large establishment; in adorning his grounds; in promoting Literature and the Arts; contributes as much to the due dispersion and future nurture of Riches, as he, who turns all his means to *Profit*. The "*Fruges consumere nati*," are as necessary as the *Fruges accrescere nati*, in this sense; though not in the sense of Horace.

ON THE CONSEQUENCES OF REDUCING PRODUCTION.

There are those, who argue, that, if an excess of Produce be admitted, a reduction of that Produce would remedy the evils arising from it. I am confident, that, comprehending all the incidents inseparable from that excess, it would greatly aggravate the disease.

They who support the opinion I oppose, forget that they cannot thus get rid of the former number of workmen, or former number of consumers; that, employed or not, the unproductive laborers must be fed; and that the loss, among the producers, is thus changed from the productive capitalist to the productive workman. If the demand of the goods of a Manufacturer, which had hitherto amounted to the value of 100,000*l.*, was reduced to 50,000*l.* —he might by reducing his produce proportionately, still go on with profit, in the case of being able to reduce his workmen, machinery, and capital, in the same degree. But if he were obliged to support the same workmen, &c., this reduction would greatly augment his loss.

This is the situation of a Kingdom, though it may not be that of individual Manufacturers. The multiplied Population must be still supported. For this reason the quantity of corn necessary to be grown cannot be much, if at all,[1] reduced, though the demand for it

---

[1] The Agricultural Report of the Br. Commons, (*June* 1821,) says that, "the annual produce of Corn, the growth of the United Kingdom, is, upon an average crop, about equal to our present annual consumption; and that, with such an average price, the present import prices, below which *foreign* corn is by law altogether excluded, are fully sufficient, more especially since the change in the value of our money, to secure to the British grower the complete monopoly of the home market."

The Committee seem willing therefore to attribute the low price to a (which stimulates *price,*) may be comparatively languid. But if it should happen to be much reduced, (a consequence which may be feared from languid demand,) it is an evil pregnant with the most fearful results. We must then resort to *Foreign* supply, to feed an unemployed Population—a drain, which would soon exhaust the most abundant wealth!

SUCCESSION of *abundant harvests.* I attribute it to this *languid* demand, arising from *want of means* in the Consumers.

If I understand the argument of the Committee, it is, that *increased means of purchase* do not materially add to the *demand,* in the article *of bread!* But do not *decreased means* take from the demand for the *adequate* quantity? If so, the low price may be independent of a succession of abundant years, and the assignment of such a temporary cause only leads to delusion.

A

PRACTICAL SCHEME

FOR THE

REDUCTION OF THE

PUBLIC DEBT

AND

TAXATION,

WITHOUT INDIVIDUAL SACRIFICE.

BY JONATHAN WILKS.

LONDON:

1822.

PRACTICAL SCHEME,

&c. &c.

MANY and various have been the Schemes of projectors, for relieving the national burdens, but so weighty have been the objections of sound reason and expediency to the plans offered, that the subject seems to be withdrawn from public attention, as one altogether hopeless of remedy, or liable to difficulties of an insurmountable nature.

We exclaim with the dramatist, "Let us rather bear the ills we have, great and perilous as they are, than fly to others that we know not of." This, however, it must be acknowledged, is but a weak and spiritless conclusion, for a high-minded people; and this tame acquiescence in existing evils, has in all ages proved a bar to moral and political improvement. Nations, like individuals, imitate the waggoner in the fable, and are ready, in periods of distress, "To fall upon their knees and solicit the aid of Jupiter," overlooking what, in the affairs of this world, is our first duty: namely, to put our shoulders to the work we have in hand, and show that we have some claim to the kind assistance of heaven.

Unappalled then by the disregard which appears to have accompanied all the proposals hitherto brought forward, for lessening the national debt, and national burdens; I appeal once more to the energies of a great and spirited people. After a mature and deep consideration of the subject, I venture to assure them, that an effort on their part, requiring no sacrifice, at all comparable with the benefits to be derived from it, will rapidly free them from one half their present burdens, and elevate the political situation of this great country, to a height hitherto unattained by any nation.

Previous, however, to the developement of this plan of relief, it is necessary to say a few words in reply to those who assert, that no change of system is required, and that "time and patience" only are wanting to relieve us from all our difficulties.

The truth of this assertion, will be best tried by a short review of our financial situation.

The public debt of this country, funded and unfunded, may be stated in round numbers at *eight hundred and fifty millions*, requiring when coupled with its attendant the sinking fund, an annual charge of nearly *fifty millions*. The current expenses of Government require about *twenty millions*, and the parochial and other local taxes will be understated at *ten millions*, making a total of annual taxation upon the United Kingdom of *eighty millions*. By estimates given in a subsequent part of this work, it will be seen, that the whole income of the United Kingdom, arising from property and labor conjointly, does not exceed *three hundred millions*; taxation therefore, of one kind or other, amounts to more than one fourth of the whole income of the country, so that a yeoman or gentleman of *five hundred pounds* yearly income, pays *one hundred and twenty-five pounds* or upwards, in taxes.

Every other income above or below the sum here stated, is taxed in proportion.—Some few exceptions may indeed occur in consequence of the different modes of living—but generally speaking, taxation falls upon all ranks in the proportion here mentioned.

During the French revolutionary war, which bore down all our rivals in commerce, the growing trade of this country enabled us to support all this immense burden. But the return of peace, giving security and animation to foreign manufacturers, brings us into commercial competition with nations, whose taxation may be stated as only one to four, of the taxation of the British Empire. Thus British industry, ingenuity, and enterprise, have to contend against an advantage to the foreigner, of nearly twenty per cent. from taxation only, exclusive of that which he derives from a more fruitful soil, and greater cheapness of labor.

Under these circumstances, it is easy to foresee, that the foreign commerce of Britain must gradually diminish, and as a natural consequence, that her revenue must diminish also;—Who! that examines the state of our foreign commerce with intelligence, can fail to perceive, that the mischief is already in progress? what article of import yields a profit to the importer? and nine times in ten, what article of export gives any profitable return? Foreign trade is become little better than a game of hazard; and though the players may continue interested for a while, without any reasonable hope of gain; yet the good sense and prudence of the British merchant, will prevent any lengthened pursuit of such a dangerous and unprofitable occupation.

Foreign commerce then, will decline, for though naval discovery, and the general increase and amelioration of mankind, from the extension of art and science, are gradually opening new markets to our enterprize and industry; still the enormous disadvantage of twenty per cent. in the cost of every article of consumption, and in the payment of every species of labor, must create such obstacles to the commerce of Britain, as all the industry and enterprize of her inhabitants cannot overcome.

Foreign manufacturers will excel us in the cheapness of their fabrics, and gradually drive us out of every market;—our naval superiority cannot long survive the loss of commerce, and our colonial possessions will become the prey of rival nations.—This may be deemed by some a gloomy picture, but its truth is already felt, by the experience of a six years' peace, and "time and patience" are more likely to add to, than diminish the evil. It may be urged, perhaps, that our national debt is about to be gradually reduced, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer is making an effort, at least, to appropriate *five millions* annually to that object;—thus after six years of peace, we begin to *talk* only of reduction; and it is more than probable, that another six years upon the same system, will find us deeper in debt than we now are. But allowing, for the sake of argument, that *five millions* surplus revenue, can be clearly made out, and annually applied to the reduction of debt; and further, that we are fortunate enough, to be blest with ten years more of uninterrupted peace; in this case, the three per cent. stock will rise to eighty or upwards, and in ten years *sixty millions* of this stock will be paid off; and the annual charge in respect of debt, will be diminished by *one million eight hundred thousand pounds;* this will be esteemed but a very meagre relief to the country—and who will venture to insure to us, ten years more of uninterrupted peace? or who will be bold enough to say, that the present enormous taxation can be borne ten years longer by a suffering people?

It is necessary also to bear in mind, that the next war we may be engaged in, will in all human probability be a maritime war, and the prize of contest be no less than the command of the ocean; we shall have to encounter an active and courageous foe, rendered confident by former success, and assisted by those European powers, who are jealous of our naval greatness. The expense of such a war will be great, whilst on the other hand, it will offer none of those commercial advantages, which enabled us to raise such vast supplies during the late French war. To enter upon such a contest, incumbered as we now are with debt and taxes, would be to offer ourselves bound hand and foot to the enemy, and could not fail to end in the ruin of our finances.

No! it is in vain to trifle any longer; we must, though reluctantly, assent to the appalling truth, either that the public debt must be wholly or in great part paid off, or this debt will plunge the nation into irretrievable confusion and misery.

The arguments which have been adduced, (and a thousand others will present themselves to every thinking mind,) are surely sufficient to prove, that the debt is become to this country, an evil of immense magnitude; and that the only question now is, how to diminish the evil? Since, to remove it altogether seems beyond our power. Fortunately for this great country, there remain abundant resources for overcoming every financial difficulty. It is only requisite, that we should have a clear and distinct view of the cause of our distress and danger, and that we should unanimously resolve to make an energetic application of those means of relief, which a kind Providence has placed within our reach.

The attainment of the following propositions, it is conceived, will accomplish such a relief to this country, as must in a short time restore life and soul to the body politic, and raise the now drooping energies of agriculture and commerce:—

First. Such a reduction of the national debt and annual charge thereon, as shall render it henceforth a burden of no baneful consequence, to a highly productive country like this.

Second. An immediate and considerable remission of duties and taxes, with a prospective remission in ten years, to the amount of nearly one half our present taxation.

Third. A security against the effects of any future wars upon our public debt, by the appropriation of certain taxes, as war taxes only, equal to any efforts the country may be called upon to make.

Fourth. A recurrence to the principles of a free trade, so far as this may be proved advantageous to commerce, and to the general welfare of the state.

Fifth. The power of resuming *safely*, though gradually, a metallic currency; the fatal departure from which may be justly considered, as one great cause of our present difficulties.

These propositions being attained, it can hardly be doubted, that a considerable reduction in the poor's-rates will follow, and we may then look forward with some confidence, to the revival of agriculture; from the combined operation of reduced taxes and poor's-rates, and the renewed activity of commerce.

Bold as the assertion may appear, I do not hesitate to declare, that the accomplishment of the propositions here enumerated, is a measure of comparatively easy attainment in this country, requiring only to be brought forward by a ministry of known ability, integrity and patriotism, possessing the confidence of the nation; or, in default of such a ministry, to be urged upon the Government, by the unanimous voice of an awakened people.

In redemption of the pledge thus confidently given, I proceed to unfold the plan of relief, reserving all explanatory remarks and arguments, to the close of the exposition, in order to present the Scheme unbroken to every calculating mind.

I propose then the following parliamentary enactments :—

First. That the sinking fund, as now constituted, do cease to form a part of the finance system of this country.

Second. That all the public annuities of a lower denomination, be consolidated into five per cent. stock, at the following rates; three per cents. at *sixty-five;* three and a half per cents. at *seventy-three and a half;* four per cents. at *eighty-one and a half;* the five per cents. remaining at par of £100.

Third. That an assessment of *twenty per cent.* shall be laid on all property in the public funds, so consolidated.

Fourth. That an assessment of *five per cent.* shall be laid on all private property, not in the British funds : valuing all fixed property, except buildings, at twenty years purchase, and all buildings, at fifteen years purchase. This assessment to be converted into a redeemable income-tax at the option of the proprietor, his property being security for the payment with interest, at five per cent. per annum, from the date of assessment.

Fifth. That an assessment of *five per cent.* be levied for the term of ten years only, upon all incomes not arising from property already assessed; such as income from foreign estates, incomes of professional men, artists, stipendiary clerks, and on all salaries above fifty-five pounds per annum.

Sixth. That a like assessment of *five per cent.* for the term of ten years only, be levied upon all net profits of trade and agriculture.

The practical application and result of these enactments will be as follows :—

538,814,815	Three per cent annuities will be converted into five per cent. stock, at sixty-five, making,	£350,229,629
32,075,450	Three and a half per cent. annuities, converted into five per cents., at seventy-three and a half, making,	23,625,455
75,514,727	Four per cent. annuities converted into five per cents., at eighty-one and a half, making,	61,544,502
148,575,487	Five per cent. annuities, at par of £100.	148,575,487
794,980,479	Total nominal debt. Making when consolidated into new five per cent. stock,	583,975,073

Amount brought forward	£583,975,073
The proposed assessment of twenty per cent. upon this property, will make a reduction to the amount of	116,795,014
	467,180,059
The private property not in the funds, amounts as will be shown hereafter, to two thousand four hundred millions, five per cent. assessment on which will make a further reduction of,	120,000,000
Remain as a total of funded debt,	£347,180,059

By these operations then, the public funded debt will be virtually reduced to 347,180,059*l.*:—Allowing for mistakes, and for such amount of capitals as may belong to Foreigners, say in round numbers, *three hundred and fifty millions* of five per cent. stock, bearing an annual charge for interest of *seventeen millions and a half*

Annual charge	say	£17,500,000
Long Annuities	amount to,	1,359,435
Interest of unfunded debt supposing about forty millions at four per cent.,		1,640,565
Will leave as a total annual charge for the public debt, funded and unfunded,		20,500,000
The charges of the civil list, of the army, navy, ordnance, and all other expences of Government, after the projected reductions, may be taken at		19,000,000
Total of net expenditure,		39,500,000
The charges of collection upon which at eight per cent. will be,		3,200,000
Making a total of expenditure for the United Kingdom, of,		£42,700,000

This sum taken from the present amount of expenditure, already stated at seventy millions, would exhibit a saving of twenty-seven millions; but preferring accuracy and clearness, to conjecture and obscurity; all the complex operations of the sinking fund, as now constituted, are struck out of our calculation, and the simple mode of deducting the total of expenditure from the gross amount of revenue, adopted as the safest ground of comparison:—

The gross amount of revenue for the year ended 5th of April, 1820, by the finance accounts for that year, is,	£61,872,588

Deduct total of expenditure as above stated,	£42,700,000
will leave a surplus revenue of,	19,172,588
The five per cent. assessment upon incomes, not arising from property already assessed, is calculated upon an amount of £40,000,000 per annum, as will be subsequently detailed, making per annum for ten years,	2,000,000
	£21,172,588
A like assessment upon £40,000,000 net profits of trade and agriculture, as will be subsequently detailed, will make per annum, for ten years,	2,000,000
Improvement in the revenue, from the remission of seventeen and a half millions, duties and taxes, together with the prevention of smuggling and frauds; will probably exceed two millions, taken only at,	1,827,412
Total surplus revenue, under the operation of the proposed assessments,	£25,000,000

The immedidte relief to the country for concurring in these assessments, may be a remission of duties and taxes as follows:—

	£	
One half the amount of assessed taxes, being,	3,240,330	
One third the amount of customs, being,	4,911,520	
One third the amount of excise, being,	9,315,270	
	£17,467,120	
	Say	17,500,000
Remain as a surplus revenue, applicable to the further reduction of debt for ten years,		£7,500,000

Seven and a half millions then of surplus revenue, will for the term of ten years, be applicable to the further reduction of public debt; and as it is probable that not more than *twenty millions* of the assessment on private property, not in the funds, will, during that period, be paid into the hands of Government, *one hundred millions* remaining on fixed property, as a redeemable tax of five per cent. upon income. So the *seventy-five millions* which will be the aggregate amount of the applicable surplus revenue, of *seven and a half millions* for ten years, will redeem *seventy-five millions* of public debt, set apart for liquidation at par;—The funded debt at the conclusion of the ten years of assessment, will be virtually diminished to *two hundred and seventy-five millions*, of five per cent. stock; because, though still nominally amounting to *three hundred and seventy-five millions*, it will in reality be reduced *one hundred millions*, by an assessment to that amount remaining upon fixed property, and for which, *five millions*, will be annually paid to Government as interest, until the capital assessment be redeemed:—

Taking then the funded debt, at the end of ten years, at two hundred and seventy-five millions of five per cent. stock:—

The annual charge will be,	£ 13,750,000
Add long annuities,	1,359,435
Also for the forty, or forty five millions which may remain of unfunded or floating debt,	1,890,565
Will leave as a total annual charge for the national debt,	£17,000,000

Under the new and improved circumstances of the country, it may be expected, that the reduction of Government expenditure, will go hand in hand with the reduction of public debt.

The saving in every department during the ten years of assessment, may be assumed at the close of that period, to amount to twenty per cent., or a saving of two per cent. each year, and the *nineteen millions*, charged upon the country under this head, would consequently be reduced to *fifteen millions*, or thereabouts. This sum added to the total annual charge in respect of the national debt, will present a total net expenditure for the United Kingdom of *thirty-two millions*, and it will now be in the power of Government to make a remission to the country of *thirty millions* of duties and taxes, in return for the *eight* or *nine millions* per annum, which the proposed new assessments upon property and income would amount to, and the clear gain to the country would be *twenty millions* per annum. The actual remission of duties and taxes might be restricted to *twenty-five millions*, still reserving a surplus revenue of *five millions*, for the purpose of reducing still further the public debt, and to make good the loss, which will ensue upon the purchases of stock, when any part of the *hundred millions*, secured on fixed property, shall be redeemed by the proprietors.

The whole of the foregoing scheme of assessment and liquidation, being designedly built upon the basis of *justice* and *equity* to every individual in the state; it becomes necessary to show, that the different assessments are awarded with the strictest impartiality, according to the existing state of landed and commercial property, and property in the public funds. The first in importance, is undoubtedly the landed proprietor; but as the practicability of the measure hinges greatly on the proposed consolidation of, and subsequent assessment upon, the debt itself, it may be well to explain the most difficult part of the subject first, and to show its operation upon the fund-holder; whose interest, notwithstanding appearances to the contrary, will be found duly considered in the final result of the measures proposed.

If we take a view of the progress and present state of the public debt, we shall perceive, that nearly three-fourths of the amount have been contracted during the late French war; when the currency of the realm was so much depreciated, that every hundred pounds borrowed, was worth no more than sixty or seventy pounds of the currency of the present day; further, that every species of property, except funded property, has experienced a depreciation equal to the present augmented value of the currency; and this depreciation of all other property, not in the funds, cannot be estimated less than twenty-five per cent.; and cousequently that funded property ought to suffer a like depreciation, or be paid in a currency of the same value as the one in which the debt was contracted. It must also be observed, that though the public debt rests upon the faith of Government and the country, yet it is idle to assert, as some do, that the whole landed and other property of the country is pledged or mortgaged, for the payment of principal and interest. The landed and other proprietors treat all such arguments with derision; and it is evident, that if by any circumstances of expensive war, or great national distress, the revenue should be found inadequate to the payment of the regular expences of Government, and the interest of the national debt, the public creditor must of necessity remit a part, or the whole of his dividend, and the amount of his capital would decline to one half or one fourth of its present market value. In the event of another war, it is more than probable that such would be his situation. We may remark further, that though the public creditor may, according to agreement, claim one hundred pounds actual money, for every hundred pounds stock standing in his name, whenever the Government chooses to pay off his demand compulsorily; yet on the other hand, the public creditor can never enforce the repayment of his capital, and his security for such repayment becomes every year more precarious; precedents also exist on record of a reduction of interest, and the stern law of necessity may soon force the ministers to propose similar reductions. Lastly, it is in the power of Government to provide for the exigences of the state by new loans, and thus to pay the annual dividends, by adding to the amount of public debt.

Keeping these various circumstances in view, it must be highly advantageous to the fund-holder, to have the finances of the country so modified, that there can henceforward exist no rational doubt, of the revenue proving equal to all the exigences of the state, and the regular discharge of the public annuities.

There seems no reason therefore, to anticipate any opposition from the fund-holders, to the proposed consolidation of the lower annuities into five per cent. stock at the rates mentioned, nor to the subsequent assessment of twenty per cent. on the amount of their property so consolidated; it would, in fact, be disparaging their powers of calculation to doubt for a moment, their acceptance of the terms proposed; for if we attend to the nature and effects of supply and demand, we shall readily perceive, that in the commodity of government stock, as in that of corn and all other marketable commodities, a reduction of one fourth or one third in the amount of supply, will in every such instance, cause a corresponding increase of demand, and a proportionate rise in the value of the remaining three fourths, or two thirds of the commodity so reduced in amount; attending to this fact it requires no acute calculation to perceive, that a reduction of the public debt to *three hundred and fifty millions*, and its further prospective reduction to *two hundred and seventy-five millions*, in ten years, accompanied with a remission of annual taxation, to the amount of *twenty-five or thirty millions* in the same period, would enable Government to borrow readily at three per cent., or in other words, that a government annuity of three pounds would be worth one hundred pounds; but if a three pounds Government annuity sell for one hundred pounds, then a five pounds annuity will sell for one hundred and sixty-six pounds, thirteen shillings, and four-pence; we will however, carry the assumed value of a five per cent. Government annuity, under the new circumstances of debt and taxation, no higher than one hundred and sixty pounds, and contemplate the situation of a ten thousand pounds fund-holder in the three per cents, under the operation of the proposed consolidation and assessment.—10,000*l.* three per cents, will, when converted into five per cent. stock at sixty-five be reduced to 6500*l.*—Twenty per cent assessment upon which, will leave 5200*l.*,—about 1300*l.* of this sum will be cancelled at par of one hundred pounds, leaving to the fund-holder only 3900*l.* permanent five per cent. stock, which stock, however, can only be cancelled at his option, and at such a price as he may be able to obtain for it in the market. The value of five per cent. stock under such circumstances, we have assumed to be one hundred and sixty pounds, though the probability is nearer one hundred and seventy.—3900*l.* stock, at one hundred and sixty pounds will produce 6240*l.*, to which add 1300*l.* cancelled at par, and he will have received 7500*l.* sterling money, for his 10,000*l.* three per cents., being little less than present market value. And when we consider that he would under any arrangement, have been subjected to an assessment of five per cent. on his property; it will appear that he is a gainer by the sum of *one hundred thirty pounds*, beyond any other proprietor of a similar amount of property; it must also be taken into consideration, that the one thousand three hundred pounds, set apart for liquidation at par, will only be paid off gradually in the period of fifteen or twenty years, that probably not more than sixty or seventy pounds of that sum, will be cancelled in any one year, and as the buyers of stock very frequently require only a temporary investment for their money, so there can be no doubt of this species of stock selling at one hundred and twenty pounds on an average; we may therefore add a further gain of *two hundred and sixty pounds*, to the one hundred and thirty already mentioned, and the fund-holder under consideration, will have received for his ten thousand pounds three per cent. stock, seven thousand eight hundred pounds sterling money, a sum equal to present market value.

It will be remarked that the holders of the higher stocks, gain something more in amount than the holders of three per cents., in proportion to their capitals; but this apparent gain arises from the higher market price of three per cent. consols, and the real advantage will belong to the latter, when the proportionate income is taken into account.

The equitable balance between the different annuitants, might perhaps be adjusted with greater nicety by adding, or deducting, a few shillings to or from the rate of consolidation; the proposed rates are however sufficiently correct for our purpose, and to show an evident advantage to all.

To fix upon a solid basis the security of the fund-holder, the three following enactments, in addition to the six already enumerated in pages 9 and 10 should receive the sanction of parliament.

First. That not more than *one hundred and twenty millions*, exclusive of the assessment on funded property, shall be compulsorily paid off at par.

Second. That the interest upon the consolidated stock, shall never be reduced lower than five per cent.

Third. That the debt so consolidated shall never again be increased, but, that the exigences of the state, whether in peace or in war, shall in all cases be provided for.

Enough has now been said to show the nature of the proposed measure as regards the public annuitant, and equally so, I trust, to convince him that the proposals are not only equitable but advantageous to himself.

Let us now examine the effect of the assessment proposed, upon proprietors of land and other fixed property; which examination may be premised by the following observation:—there are but two sources of wealth from which taxes of every kind must be paid; namely, the produce of the soil, and the profits obtained by trade with foreign nations: nearly the whole weight of taxes then, however circuitous their operation, must eventually be borne by the soil, and the smaller the amount of taxation, the more can the other classes of the state afford to give for the produce of the soil: It is essential that the landed proprietor should bear this fact in mind, in forming his opinion of the measures now proposed.

The probability being that rents will fall on the recurrence of peace prices, so the valuation of fixed property in land, mines, canals, &c., should not exceed twenty years purchase, upon which calculation a land proprietor, possessing a clear rental of *five hundred pounds*, per annum, would be assessed on a property of *ten thousand pounds;* and the amount of his assessment would be *five hundred pounds* payable with interest at five per cent. per annum, from the date of assessment. Those proprietors who possess funded property, or other funds equal to the immediate payment of the tax, will naturally free their estates from the impost by an immediate payment of the amount to Government; but in all cases, where a disadvantage or inconvenience may be felt in raising the sum required, the proprietor so situated, may convert the assessment into a redeemable income-tax, his lands, &c. being security for the capital assessment, and the annual interest of five per cent.: the tax in this case upon a proprietor to the amount stated of *ten thousand pounds,* will pay annually *twenty-five pounds* or five per cent. upon his income of *five hundred pounds;* or it may be that he can raise the capital assessment by mortgage at four per cent., to some of the many capitalists, who will want investments for their money; in which case, the tax upon his income will not exceed *twenty pounds;* whichever way he may choose to arrange the matter, the tax cannot be deemed oppressive if we consider the objects to be obtained.

The proprietors of houses and buildings will be assessed at fifteen years purchase of rental only, so that an income arising from this species of property of *five hundred pounds* per annum, would be assessed on a property of *seven thousand five hundred pounds,* and the amount of assessment would be *three hundred and seventy-five pounds,* payable with five per cent. interest from the date of assessment, and which he in like manner as the land proprietor, may convert into a redeemable income tax; his buildings being security for the payment of capital and interest; the annual amount of assessment on this proprietor, would be *eighteen pounds fifteen shillings,* until the redemption of assessment.

These examples will be sufficient to show the nature and extent of the proposed assessment, upon all proprietors of fixed property, and it will be seen that no material difficulty or pressure of taxation, can be felt by this class of proprietors.

The assessment next to be considered, is that upon capital and stock employed in trade and agriculture; capital lent out upon interest, or invested in foreign funds:—All this species of property must be given in to commissioners, upon oath if required, and three years may be allowed for payment by regular instalments, including interest at five per cent., from the date of assessment; and as the tax will be levied upon actual property only, clear of debts and incumbrances, nothing oppressive can be felt by a proprietor of *ten thousand pounds* agricultural or trading capital, or capital otherwise invested, paying *five hundred pounds* assessment, either immediately or by instalments in three years, with interest as suits his convenience. A proprietor of this class, to the amount of *one thousand pounds* only, will find it as little burdensome to pay *fifty pounds*, in the same manner. Any proprietor of this class, possessing lands, houses, or other fixed property, may have the assessment on his capital or stock transferred to the fixed property, and converted into a redeemable income-tax, paying the interest only at five per cent., until a convenient opportunity for redeeming the assessment; thus if a proprietor of trading capital of ten thousand pounds, possess buildings valued at one hundred pounds per annum; the property tax on such buildings at fifteen years purchase, would be seventy-five pounds, or a redeemable income-tax of three pounds fifteen shillings per annum; and those same buildings may at his option, become security for the assessment on his capital, namely five hundred pounds, and be liable to a redeemable income-tax of twenty-five pounds more, or in the whole of twenty-eight pounds fifteen shillings per annum;—facilities might also be offered to this class of proprietors, of giving security for the amount of assessment, upon goods of double the value for a certain term: notice to be given on the sale of such goods, that the tax collector may receive the amount of assessment, previous to any application of the proceeds.

This detail has been thought necessary to show the practical nature of the assessment on property, and that the whole may be effected, without any great transfer of capital, or inconvenient pressure upon any class of individuals in the state.

Under the circumstances of a general property-tax of the nature described, there can be no solid objection on the part of professional men, artists, stipendiary clerks, and others in the receipt of incomes of fifty-five pounds per annum, and upwards, to submit to a tax of five per cent. on such incomes for ten years; at the conclusion of which period, the public debt being reduced to *two hundred and seventy-five millions*, bearing an annual charge of less than *fourteen millions*, there will be no further occasion for this tax.

All net profits of trade and agriculture, will be subject to a like assessment of five per cent. on the amount for ten years only.

Objections may indeed arise, to the imposition of these two assessments, as being taxes upon the talent and industry of the country; but as it will be proved that every species of income, will be benefitted to double the amount of assessment, the objections will speedily fall away. We must reflect also, that the tax on property will be equal to five per cent. on income arising from it, in perpetuity; and though it would be unfair to tax mere income and profits in an equal degree, yet they may be equitably called upon for a proportionate contribution, when the benefits to be derived will be so great and so general. With respect to carrying the assessment so low as incomes of fifty-five pounds per annum, it may be observed, that the possessor of such income is probably as able to contribute two pounds fifteen shillings, as the possessor of thousands his proportionate tax, and also that the smaller income will be benefitted in a rateable degree with the other.

On looking back to the five propositions, on the attainment of which, we rested our hopes of permanent relief to the country: we have shown in respect to the *first* of those propositions, that an assessment of twenty per cent. on the debt itself, of five per cent. upon property not in the funds, and of five per cent. for ten years only, upon all incomes not arising from property already assessed, and upon all net profits of trade and agriculture, will reduce the public debt immediately to *three hundred and fifty millions*, and the annual charge thereon to *seventeen millions and a half*, that a provision is made for a further reduction of debt, to the amount of *seventy-five millions* in ten years, at the end of which period the funded debt will be reduced virtually to *two hundred and seventy-five millions*, bearing an annual charge of less than *fourteen millions*.

In respect of the *second* of those propositions, it has been shown, that the same assessments will cause an immediate remission of duties and taxes, to the amount of *seventeen and a half millions*, providing also for ten years, an annual surplus revenue of *seven and a half millions*, to be applied to the further reduction of the public debt; that this annual surplus, joined to the saving in government expences, will enable Government to remit a further amount of *seven hundred and seventy-five thousand pounds* annually, in duties and taxes, for the period of ten years; and at the close of that period, the duties and taxes remitted to the country will form an aggregate of *twenty-five millions*, and a surplus revenue, of *five millions*, may still remain applicable to the further gradual reduction of the public debt.

It may here be added, that these great effects will be accomplished without sacrifice; for it cannot be called sacrifice, when each individual in the state contributes in proportion only to his property and ability; and when the ultimate relief from taxation, so much overbalances the assessments imposed.

Let us now turn our attention to the *third* proposition; namely, "a provision against the effect of any future wars upon our public debt, by an appropriation of certain taxes as war taxes only, equal to any efforts the country may be called upon to make."

This proposition is one of vast importance, and demands our clear and unbiassed consideration: it is one of necessary adoption whenever we enter into terms with the public creditor, for it cannot be supposed that he will consent to relinquish any part of the contract, upon which he lent his money, unless he be secured from the effects of future rapid accumulation of debt, and consequent risk of national bankruptcy; now the only way to secure him and the country from a recurrence of the same untoward circumstances, is to pass a solemn act of the legislature, that the charges of the state, of whatever nature, whether in peace or in war, shall in all cases be provided for, without adding to the public debt. Such a determination on the part of the legislature, could not possibly cause any anxiety or alarm, when we consider that a property tax of one per cent. and an equivalent assessment of ten per cent. upon income and net profits, would raise a fund of *thirty-five millions*, which sum would constitute a whole war tax, or, in other words, that *thirty-five millions* is as large a sum as any war, however tremendous, could possibly call for in any one year. Larger sums were no doubt expended, in some years of the late war, but it may be safely asserted, that *thirty-five millions*, raised in the manner proposed, under the improved finances of the country, would be equal to *fifty millions*, raised in the depreciated currency, and expended under the ruinous finance system of the late war.

It is to be hoped also, that some wisdom has been gained by dear-bought experience, and that we shall not repeat the folly of becoming *principals* in a war, where we are least interested, and of consuming the vitals of our strength for mercenary and rival nations, who are now reaping the benefits of our overstrained exertions.

Under a prudent government, the severest war should not cost the British Empire more than half a war tax, or seventeen millions and a half in any one year, (except perhaps the first,) and where, one may ask, could the burden of such a tax be felt, when the proposed reduction of debt and taxes shall have taken place?

One very important advantage would arise from this mode of raising the supplies for war: hostilities would never be lightly entered into, because the immediate consequences would operate powerfully on our legislators; and it must be acknowledged there is something base in shoving the burden of war from our own shoulders, and leaving posterity to groan under the curse our folly and extravagance have brought upon them. On the whole, there seems no solid objection, but, on the contrary, many weighty inducements, to appropriate such a fund as a war fund. Under the protection of such a system, the public debt would go on diminishing during the heaviest wars, and the close of every struggle would find us with improved finances, and unimpaired vigor for the contest. Indeed this immense difference would be found, between raising the sums required by the state within the year, and allowing the amount to accumulate as a debt, providing for the interest only; that in the first case, prices of all commodities continuing moderate or even lower than before, the value of property would remain steady, or suffer no variation of consequence; whereas, under the system of accumulating debt, prices of all commodities rise as a natural effect, property becomes represented by a high nominal value, and when peace brings all back again to its true estimation, property suffers a proportionate fall in value, and the country is borne down by a debt and annual charge, nearly double the actual amount borrowed.

The *fourth* proposal for consideration, is, to acquire the power of recurring to the principles of free trade with foreign nations. These principles have, for a series of years, been so totally disregarded by this country, that a recurrence to them will be a measure of great difficulty. Some indications of such a return have indeed been lately fostered by Government, and a committee is at this time appointed by Parliament, to report upon the subject. It is not difficult to foretell what will be the result of their investigations, so long as the present finance system shall continue. How, indeed! can a free trade be thought of, under a taxation of seventy millions? The only possibility of resuming a free trade, must be by diminishing taxation; and how can this be adequately effected, but by diminishing the public debt?

That the debt can be diminished, and taxation considerably reduced, without any heavy pressure on the community, has we hope been sufficiently proved; an immediate remission of duties and taxes to the amount of *seventeen and a half millions*, with a further certain annual reduction to the amount of *seven hundred and seventy-five thousand pounds*, will, under prudent fiscal legislation, effect something towards the accomplishment of a free trade, and the revival of commerce; and through commerce to the support of agriculture. It is not meant to imply, that commerce is to be first considered in the proposed relief from taxes; let every *possible* relief be first granted to agriculture. But if the agriculturist can be relieved only by compelling the other classes of the community to pay an excessive price for corn, then it is vain to look for relief; for such a remedy would soon be found worse than the disease. A revival in commerce is the only means of causing a profitable consumption of the products of the soil; and the agriculturist may be assured, that every attempt to transfer the burden of taxation from his own shoulders, on to those of commerce, will return with increased pressure upon his own.

Let not then a foolish jealousy exist between the agricultural and commercial classes, as though the one could be benefited at the expence of the other; connected and upholding each other, as they do in this country, whatever oppresses the one, cannnot fail to injure the other. Let them unite then, in pressing upon the legislature, the necessity of one general and equal contribution from all classes of the state, towards the reduction of that enormous debt and consequent excessive taxation, under the baneful operation of which, the energies of this industrious nation are exerted in vain.

The power of resuming safely, though gradually, a metallic currency forms the *fifth* and last proposition to be considered. This is a subject upon which much has been written and said. It is not my intention to enter into any lengthened discussion on a question of such intricacy; a few plain facts will, perhaps, serve to guide the judgment better than much argument.

If these islands were separated from all intercourse with the rest of the world, it would signify little what representative of wealth, or, in other words, what circulating medium we made use of, in our transactions with each other. That which was the cheapest and most difficult to counterfeit, might, under proper regulation, be the best; yet even under these circumstances, it would be in the highest degree dangerous to allow Government, and still more a private banking company, to manufacture this representative at pleasure, and to be exonerated by law from restoring that valuable consideration for which the representative was issued. If the extreme danger of such a measure be apparent even in a country debarred from intercourse with other nations, what must we think of its folly and ruinous consequences, in a state the most extensively connected, and whose commercial and political intercourse is more widely extended, than that of any nation on the globe?

So long, then, as we deem it wise and politic to cultivate a commercial intercourse with foreign countries, so long will it be incumbent upon us, to adopt the precious metals of gold and silver as the lawful representatives of wealth; because all the other civilized nations of the globe, have tacitly agreed to accept of these representatives in exchange for their valuable commodities: this consideration, I conceive, prevents the necessity of any further argument rspecting the best representative of wealth, and it becomes a duty of the first importance for this nation to return to a metallic currency. I am aware that the Parliament of this country has shown its adoption of these sentiments by passing an act for an immediate return to cash payments, and that the act is now in partial operation. But I am at a loss to conceive how a taxation of *seventy millions* can be paid in gold, without entailing the ruin of the country. It would have been wiser, and much safer, to have continued the paper currency, under certain restrictions, until such a reduction of the public debt as we have here contemplated, had been some time in operation, accompanied with such a reduction of annual charge for debt, and the ordinary expenditure of Government, as would have rendered a return to cash payments a measure of safe adoption.

The danger of resuming cash payments, previous to a change in our finance system, will become apparent, by showing the relative proportions of property and debt during the war, and at this present time; at the recommencement of the French war in 1803, when the effects of the Bank restriction bill had been fully felt upon the nominal value of property, the private property not in the funds was equal in value to 3200 millions, and the public debt in that year, was, in round numbers, 600 millions. The debt then, in 1803, bore a proportion to property of less than one to five. Property has now suffered a depression of twenty-five per cent. and is estimated at two thousand four hundred millions only, whilst the debt is increased to eight hundred and fifty millions. At present then, aided by the cash payment bill, the debt bears a proportion to property as one and one-sixteenth to three, constituting more than one-third of the whole property of the country. If the present system be suffered to go on for some years longer, it requires no great effort of reason to foretell, that property will suffer a further depression of twenty-five or thirty per cent.; the debt will then amount to full one half the whole property of the country; and if in this situation of the Empire, a war should ensue, (an event not improbable during our state of financial weakness,) what would become of the cash payment bill? Surely no further argument is required to show, that though cash payments are re-established by act of Parliament, the resumption can only be considered partial and temporary, and its continuance, under the present finance system, must be of short duration.

The Scheme here proposed for the reduction of debt and expenditure, would, in the period of ten years, make the relative proportion of debt to property, as one to eight only, and taxation would be reduced from seventy millions, to one half that amount; the return to cash payments might then be safely adopted, and the act with equal confidence be made perpetual.

It is hoped, that our statements thus far, supported as they have been both by calculation and reasoning, will have produced the necessary conviction of their truth, and of their general equity in operation. There remain now to be considered, the bases on which the property of the United Kingdom is estimated, and those also upon which is built the amount of income and net profits subject to assessment. The authorities followed in these estimates are Colquhoun in his Treatise on the Wealth, &c. of the British Empire, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Vansittart, who during the late session of Parliament declared in the House of Commons, that the property (meaning income,) given in for the income-tax, was upwards of two hundred millions, and that a considerable amount was not given in at all.

By contrasting these two authorities, and adopting only such results as are consonant to the facts brought forward by each, we shall approximate to the truth sufficiently for the purposes required: accuracy to a point, in calculations of such magnitude, cannot be attained, neither is it necessary. Care, however, has been taken to reduce the calculation whenever any doubt could arise of its being overstated.

In estimating the value of land, the following scale, though somewhat above Colquhoun, may be considered moderate:

	Acres.	*per acre.*	£.
Gardens and nurseries	20,000,	at £5.	100,000
Lands highly cultivated, near large towns	500,000,	at £4.	2,000,000
Hop grounds	100,000,	at £3.	300,000
Lands cultivated of superior quality	12,000,000,	at £2.	24,000,000
Lands cultivated of inferior quality	18,000,000,	at £1.	18,000,000
Carried over	30,620,000,	acres.	£44,000,000,=880,000,000

Estimated at twenty years' purchase of the rental.

Brought forward 30,620,000, acres.	£44,000,000,=	880,000,000
Lands in Scotland taken at one-fifth	8,800,000,=	176,000,000
Ditto in Ireland do. at two-fifths,	17,600,000,=	352,000,000
Aggregate rental and total value of the lands of the United Kingdom	£70,400,000,=	1408,000,000

This aggregate value of one thousand four hundred and eight millions, to avoid excess, is taken at *thirteen hundred millions* only, for the purpose of assessment.

The dwelling houses not included in the rent of lands, Colquhoun numbers at somewhat more than two millions for Great Britain, and estimates their value at a very low calculation, to be, at twenty years' purchase for Great Britain, at £270,000,000.

Steam engines and other expensive machinery	at	60,000,000.
For Ireland in proportion	at	70,000,000.
		£400,000,000.

Aggregate value, *four hundred millions*:—this valuation was formed under an estimated population of seventeen millions, now increased to twenty millions, so that five hundred thousand houses may be added to the number, and their value, along with that of factories, warehouses, and machinery, is considerably augmented, which circumstances would add upwards of *one hundred millions* to the aggregate value; it must, however, be recollected, that the value for assessment, is calculated only at fifteen years' purchase of the rental, which would again reduce the amount to Colquhoun's estimate, and which is consequently the one adopted.

Tithes belonging to the laity, are taken after Colquhoun at *eighty millions.* Mines and minerals at *seventy millions.* Canals, tolls, and timber, at *fifty millions.*

It is impossible to form any calculation approaching to accuracy, of the property not fixed, consisting of capital and stock, employed in trade or agriculture, capitals invested in foreign funds, or lent out on interest, household furniture, plate, jewels, and money. In this great uncertainty, care must be taken to fix a low estimate. Capital, or rather live and dead stock, within the United Kingdom, is thus valued by Colquhoun:

Manufactured Goods,	at	£180,000,000
Shipping,	at	27,000,000
Agricultural Live Stock,	at	183,000,000
Ditto Dead Stock,	at	45,000,000
Fisheries,	at	10,000,000
Household Furniture, Plate, and Money,	at	244,000,000
Making an aggregate of		£689,000,000

Several of these items, if valued at all, must be taken at low estimates; but, considering that capitals at home or in Foreign countries, and British capital in Foreign funds, are not included: it will be keeping sufficiently within bounds, to estimate the aggregate of this kind of property at *five hundred millions*, which sum is accordingly taken for assessment.

These several amounts will form a total of property for the United Kingdom, exclusive of funded property, of *two thousand four hundred millions*, and the five per cent. assessment upon this property, will amount to the sum of *one hundred and twenty millions*, or at an interest of five per cent., a redeemable income-tax of six millions per annum.

The following list, taken from Colquhoun, of incomes arising from profession, government offices, the arts, and fixed salaries, though defective in many particulars, will form sufficient data, to prevent an exaggerated statement:

Ranks and descriptions.	Heads of Families.	Averaged Incomes. £	Aggregate Incomes. £
Royal	12		500,000
State and revenue higher officers,	3500	980	3,430,000
Do. inferior officers	18000	300	5,400,000
Army, (officers)	21000	at 200 each, say half	2,100,000
Navy, (officers)	8380	at 250 each, say half	1,045,000
Half-pay (officers,) military and naval	6500	at 100 each, say half	325,000
Clergymen, [eminent]	1500	720 each, say half	1,080,000
——,[minor]	17500	200	3,500,000
Law, including all classes	19000	400	7,600,000
Physic, ditto	18000	300	5,400,000
Fine arts, ditto	5000	280	1,400,000
Engineers, surveyors, builders	8700	300	2,610,000
Clerks and shopmen to merchants, bankers, &c.	Individuals 95000	70	6,750,000
Inn-keepers & publicans	87500	100	8,750,000
Universities & chief schools	874	600	524,000

Amount carried over, £50,414,000

Amount brought forward			£50,414,000
Persons employed in the education of youth	35000	204	3,500,000
Dissenting clergymen,	5000	100	500,000
Persons employed at theatres, concerts, &c.	875	200	175,000
			£54,589,000

It will be seen, that in this statement every article relating to the army and navy is carried out at one half the amount only, and the same has been done in that relating to the education of youth. Some other articles call also for reduction; particularly those relating to state and revenue; on the other hand, population having increased one-sixth, since the above estimate was formed, that circumstance might add five or six millions to the amount, and make up for exaggeration. A further diminution, however, seems necessary in calculations of this nature, and the whole amount for assessment is taken at *forty millions* only.

In the absence of precise data, on which to form an estimate of the net profits of trade and agriculture, Colquhoun's valuation of the incomes of persons engaged in those pursuits, has been taken at one half only, the other half of their incomes being supposed to arise from property. The following then is adopted as a probable basis:—

	Heads of families.	Averaged profits.	£.
Farmers,	280,000,	60	16,800,000
Eminent Merchants and Bankers	3,500,	1,300	4,550,000
Lesser Merchants, trading by Sea, & Brokers	22,800,	400	9,120,000
Ship builders	500,	400	200,000
Ship owners for freight	8,750,	300	2,625,000
Manufacturers in all branches	44,000,	200	8,800,000
Principal warehousemen, trading by wholesale	900,	400	360,000
Shop-keepers and retail Tradesmen	140,000,	100	14,000,000
		Amount carried over	£56,455,000

Amount brought forward			£56,455,000
Tailors, Mantua-makers, and Milliners	43,750	90	3,800,000
			£60,255,000

The increased population since the time this estimate was formed, would add one-sixth, or ten millions, to the amount; but this, like the former calculation, being liable to much error, is taken for the purposes of assessment, at *forty millions* only.

These two estimates; of income not arising from property, and net profits; it will be recollected, are assessed at five per cent. for ten years, and produce an annual sum of four millions for that period. A short summary of the several assessments and the amount of income, will show how nearly they approximate to the exposition of Mr. Vansittart, already quoted:—

	£		£	
Land	1,300	millions, income	65	millions
Houses & buildings	400		20	
Tithes of the laity, mines and minerals, canals, tolls and timber	200		10	
Capital and stock	500		25	
Funded property	560		28	
Total property	2960	Income	148	millions
Income of professions, &c.			40	
Net profits of trade and agriculture			40	
Total of taxed income			228	
Income from labor not taxed			72	
Total income of the United Kingdom,			300	millions

By the above summary of property and income, it will be seen, that our estimate of taxed income, exceeds the amount stated by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, by the sum of twenty-eight millions only, and this excess may be easily accounted for by Mr. Vansittart's assertion, that more than two hundred millions were returned, and that a considerable sum was not given in at all. It must also be recollected, that the property of merchants trading to foreign countries, was, during many years of the war, very doubtful and precarious, and large sums were actually lost by confiscation of British property, under which circumstances no income could be returned. Considerable reliance then may be placed on the correctness of the calculations adopted as the basis of assessment; and a general assurance may be felt, that the amount is rather under than over-rated.

At all events, there can exist no error of sufficient magnitude to endanger the efficiency of the plan proposed, since an over statement of *four hundred millions* in the estimate of property, will only affect the general result, to the amount of one million per annum.

Let us now take a dispassionate view of the whole compass and beneficial result of the plan proposed:

The assessment on property is one hundred and twenty millions, or per annum,	£6,000,000
The assessment on the funds, about one hundred and sixteen millions, or per annum,	5,800,000
The assessment on incomes of profession, &c. and net profits for ten years only, per annum,	4,000,000
Making a total annual charge of	£15,800,000

But from this annual charge, we may, in strict calculation, strike out the assessment on the fund-holder, the advantages to him in improved security and eventual amount of property, being more than equivalent to the charge upon him.

The four millions also upon incomes of profession, &c. and upon net profits of trade and agriculture, being for ten years only, must be estimated at somewhat less than two millions of permanent charge; the whole then becomes reduced to a permanent annual charge upon the country of eight millions only; in return for which, there will be an immediate remission of seventeen and a half millions, in duties and taxes: a further annual remission of duties and taxes during ten years, of seven hundred and seventy-five thousand pounds; at the conclusion of which period, there will have resulted an aggregate relief to the country, of *twenty-five millions* in duties and taxes. Further, the public funded debt, which is now nearly eight hundred millions, will in ten years be reduced to *two hundred and seventy-five millions*, and the annual charge thereon, from being *forty-seven millions*, will decline to *fourteen millions*. The whole of the gross taxation upon the country, which in 1820 was (exclusive of parochial taxes) *sixty-two millions*, will in 1832 be reduced to *thirty-five millions*, which sum includes a provision of *five millions* applicable to the further reduction of debt. The result of the whole then, may without exaggeration, be stated as a clear gain to the country, beyond the assessment required, of *twenty millions per annum!*

It may be difficult to show the exact sum of relief, which the remission of any given amount of duties and taxes will produce to each individual, the operation of such relief being both direct and indirect. We may, however, calculate the probable expenditure out of any income, in articles liable to customs and excise, and the probable amount of assessed taxes, and thus obtain the direct operation. The immediate remission of duties and taxes, under the proposed measures, we have shown, will be seventeen millions and a half; allowing a reduction of one-third in customs and excise, and of one-half in assessed taxes; and the effect of this general relief upon an income of five hundred pounds per annum may be considered as follows:

	Expenditure.		Taxation.			
Wines, foreign,	£35		£20			
Malt Liquors,	15		7	10		
Spirits, British & foreign,	6		4			
Tea and coffee,	20		10			
Groceries, spices, and salt,	18		8			
Soap and candles,	10		5			
			54	10		
			5	10	Importers' & dealers' profit, ten per cent.	
			60		Proposed relief one third	£20
Assessed Taxes,	20		20		Proposed relief one half	10
Parochial and local Taxes,	10		10		Assumed relief one third, say	3
The remaining items of expenditure, such as rent, provisions of all kinds, wages, &c. &c. may be filled up and varied at pleasure, but the effect of indirect taxation cannot be less than twelve and a half per cent. on the amount.	366	say,	45		Assumed relief one third	15
		Amount of taxation,	135		Immediate relief	48
					Deduct assessment on income,	25
Total of expenditure	£500				Immediate gain	£23

In the preceding statement, it will be seen, that the certain remission in duties and taxes, will amount to thirty pounds, which is already five pounds gain over the assessments proposed. We have assumed a diminution of one-third in the parochial and local taxes, and calculating the amount of taxes acting indirectly upon the remaining items of expenditure, to be twelve and a half per cent. we have assumed a reduction of one-third of this indirect taxation to be a consequence of the proposed remission of seventeen millions and a half in duties and taxes: this fixes the amount of immediate relief upon an income of five hundred pounds, at 48*l.*, from which deducting the amount of assessment, twenty-five pounds, the immediate gain to the individual will be 23*l.* or nearly five per cent. upon his income. This relief too will be progressive every year, and in the course of fifteen or twenty years will amount to ten per cent. upon income, beyond the amount of assessment.

Taking then, a mere mercantile view of the measure proposed, and estimating its merits by the simple rule of profit and loss, we shall perceive that the gain to the country and to every individual would be great. But a more enlarged mind will prefer the consideration of its vast importance, as affecting the political situation of the British Empire; giving *health and vigor to our finances; security and steadiness to property;* and by cutting off innumerable temptations to fraud and perjury, improving the morals and adding to the happiness of the people.

It would be folly to expect, that a plan so vast and embracing so many interests, can be brought into operation without numerous objections and some real difficulties. Some perhaps will say, that too little is done, and others, too much. The intention of the writer has been, to steer a middle course: to do less would make the relief inadequate; to do more, would cause a too sudden revulsion of property from one channel to another. The Scheme proposed, though attended by such momentous results, will cause no sudden change in the money market, since the payments to Government, and subsequent liquidation of the public debt, will probably never much exceed ten millions in one year.

Financial men may object, that it will cost the country an immense sum to pay off the remaining three hundred and seventy-five millions of five per cent. stock, and that a considerable sum will be lost every year, by payments in redemption of the assessment on property; there will, however, be no loss of any moment, until the lapse of fifteen or twenty years; and though from one to two millions per annum, may then be lost by redemptions of assessment, such loss will be more than replaced by the increased produce of the remaining duties and taxes, joined to the prevention of frauds and smuggling; and it must also be observed, that a surplus revenue of five millions is set apart for the purpose of meeting such eventual losses, and for the further gradual reduction of public debt.

The debt, however, being virtually reduced to two hundred and seventy-five millions, bearing an annual charge of fourteen millions only, the necessity of any further rapid reduction will be done away; and sound policy may then require, that not more than two or three millions should be annually applied to that object; it is needless, therefore, to bestow any more time in reply to difficulties of this nature.

Real difficulties will undoubtedly present themselves in the valuation of property, fixed and unfixed, of income, and net profits; but similar if not greater difficulties, were encountered and overcome during the late war. As a permanent or ordinary source of revenue, a tax on property or income is highly exceptionable, being of a nature so inquisitorial and repugnant to the general principles of freedom; but as a relief from pressing evils, or as a mighty resource during war, it may be submitted to by a free people, not only without degradation, but as a proof of the highest patriotism, and most honorable support of national faith.

Many minor obstacles may no doubt occur, when the whole Scheme is brought into practical application; but I trust there are none which reflection and perseverance may not remove; and it may be confidently expected, that no difficulties will arise, half so formidable in their nature, as those which *must* result from a continuation of the present system.

In conclusion then, we may appeal not only to the patriotism and good sense, but also to the selfinterest of every class of subjects in the United Kingdom, and call upon them to join in the active promotion and adoption of such a plan of finance as is here offered to the public.

A general hope was indulged by the country during the last and previous sessions of Parliament, that his Majesty's ministers would bring forward some measure calculated to relieve the country from the evils of accumulating debt and taxation; but, whether unwilling to risk their credit in the attempt, or waiting to be impelled by the public voice; the sum of their deliberations has been, to recommend "time and patience," as sovereign remedies for a nation's woes. Unfortunately for our hopes, they have fixed no period to this patient endurance; six years have passed without any real diminution to our difficulties.

Trade, indeed, has revived a little, and the commercial laborer being in the receipt of moderate wages, and finding provisions cheap, has no reason to complain. But not so the landholder, the farmer, and the agricultural laborer, "time and patience" have done nothing, can do nothing for them; and the impolitic return to cash payments, before effecting an adequate reduction of debt and taxation, will bear down with accumulating force upon these classes of the community. What then, one may ask, ought to be the objects of the landed interest under such circumstances? Surely not the miserable repeal of a few taxes, which seem to bear more particularly upon agriculture. Can this great body of the state, possessing the power to rescue their country from impending ruin, contentedly sit down, session after session, in the enjoyment of so poor a triumph, seemingly unconscious that their own power and wealth are crumbling beneath the effects of a system which spreads a desolating blight over the noblest kingdom of the globe?

Let us hope, that the aristocracy of this realm, descendants of a long line of patriots, will arouse from a lethargy so fatal to their country, and interpose their powerful veto to the continuance for another year, of the same destructive system of finance. That which is now proposed in its place, is not given with the presumptuous idea, that something still better may not be substituted, but it is offered as a basis, on which legislative wisdom may erect a noble superstructure, and secure for ages the wealth and power of the British Empire.

LETTERS

TO MR. T. CAMPBELL,

AS FAR AS REGARDS POETICAL CRITICISM, &c. &c.

AND THE

ANSWER

TO THE WRITER IN THE QUARTERLY REVIEW,

AS FAR AS THEY RELATE TO THE SAME SUBJECTS.

SECOND EDITIONS.

TOGETHER WITH

AN ANSWER TO SOME OBJECTIONS;

AND FURTHER ILLUSTRATIONS.

BY THE REV. WM. L. BOWLES.

LONDON: 1822.

VOL. XX. *Pam.* NO. XL. 2 L

AN
ANSWER
TO
SOME OBSERVATIONS
OF
THOMAS CAMPBELL, ESQ.
IN HIS
SPECIMENS OF BRITISH POETS.

SIR,

A SHORT time since a friend of yours, and one of the most distinguished poets of the present day, informed me that there had appeared, in the Morning Chronicle, an extract from your Specimens of British Poets, entitled, "CAMPBELL's Answer to BOWLES." I have since read, with much pleasure, the work from which the extract was taken; and I beg to return you my thanks, for the kind manner with which my name is introduced, though you profess to differ from me, and state at large the grounds of that difference, on a point of criticism. The criticism of mine, which you have discussed, is that which appears in the last volume of the last edition of Pope's Works, entitled, "On the Poetical Character of Pope."

As the opinion pronounced by the editor of the Morning Chronicle will probably be the opinion of all who read, without much reflection, *not* my *criticism*, but *your* representation of it; I am bound, in justice to myself, to state the grounds of my proposition clearly; to meet the arguments you have brought against it, manfully but respectfully; and to make the public (at least that part of the public which may be interested in such a discussion) a *judge* between us!

I feel it the more incumbent on me to do this, knowing the deserved popularity of your name, and the impression which your representation of my arguments must make on the public; though I must confess, it does appear to me that you could not have read the criticism which you discuss.

I do not think that any thing, Sir, you have advanced, at all shakes the propositions I have laid down; and, moreover, I do not doubt I shall be able to *prove* that you have misconceived my meaning; ill supported your own arguments; *confounded* what I had *distinguished;* and even given me grounds to think you had replied to propositions which you *never read,* or, at least, of which you could have read only the *first* sentence, omitting that which was integrally and essentially connected with it.

In an article in the Edinburgh Review, the same mis-statement was made, and the same course of argument pursued. I feel, indeed, bound to thank Mr. JEFFREY, if he wrote the article, for the liberal tribute he paid to my *poetry,* at the expense of my *canons of criticism.* But in truth, from the coincidences here remarked, I might be led to think Mr. CAMPBELL wrote the Review, were I not more disposed to think he drew his knowledge of my criticism on Pope, *not* from the criticism itself, but, *at second-hand,* from the *criticism on the criticism* in that Review, inadvertently involving himself in all its misconceptions and misrepresentations.

For, I beg you to observe, Sir, that in my first proposition, I do not say that WORKS OF ART are in no instances *poetical;* but only that "what is sublime or beautiful in works of nature is MORE so!" The very expression "*more so*" is a proof that poetry belongs, though not in the same degree, to both. I must also beg you to remark, that, having laid down this position, I observe, in the very next sentence, (lest it should be misunderstood as it now is, and was by a writer in the Edinburgh Review,) substantially as follows,—that the loftier passions of human nature are *more* poetical than artificial *manners;* the one being eternal, the other local and transitory. I think the mere stating of these circumstances will be sufficient to show, that both the Edinburgh Review and yourself have completely misrepresented my meaning. With respect to the images FROM ART, which you have adduced as a triumphant answer to what I laid down, I shall generally observe, that *your own illustrations* are against you. The Edinburgh Review, in the same manner, had spoken of the Pyramids. Now the Pyramids of Egypt, the Chinese Wall, &c. had occurred to me, at the time of writing, as undoubtedly POETICAL in WORKS OF ART; but I supposed that any reflecting person would see that these were poetical, *not essentially as works of art,* but from associations both with the highest feelings of nature, and some of her sublimest external works. The generations swept away round the ancient base of the Pyramids, the ages that are past since their erection, the mysterious obscurity of their origin, and many other complex ideas, enter into the imagination at the thought of these wonderful structures, besides the association with boundless deserts; as the Wall of China is associated with unknown rocks, mountains, and rivers. Build a pyramid of *new* brick, of the same dimensions as the pyramids of Egypt, in Lincoln's-Inn Fields, and then say how much of the poetical sublimity of the immense and immortal piles in the deserts of Egypt is derived, *not from art*, but from moral associations!! Place your own image of the "GIANT OF THE WESTERN STAR" upon such a pyramid, if it could be made as HIGH as the Andes, and say whether it would be considered as *poetical* as now it appears, "looking from its throne of clouds o'er half the world." I had often considered these and such instances generally and specifically; and I think, if you reflect a moment, you will agree with me, that though they are works of art, they are rendered POETICAL chiefly by moral associations and physical circumstances. But to come to your most interesting example. Let us examine the ship which you have described so beautifully. On what does the poetical beauty depend? not on *art*, but NATURE.[2] Take away[3] the *waves*, the *winds*, the *sun*, that, in association with the streamer and sails, make them look so beautiful! take all poetical association away, ONE will become a strip of blue bunting, and the other a piece of coarse canvas on three tall poles!!

You speak also of the *poetical* effect of the *drum* and *fife!* Are the drum and fife poetical, without other associations? In the quotation from Shakespeare which you adduce, the fife is "ear piercing," and the drum is "spirit stirring;" and both are associated, by the consummate art of Shakespeare—with what?—with the "PRIDE, POMP, and CIRCUMSTANCE of GLORIOUS WAR!" and passions and pictures are called up; those of fortitude, of terror, of pity, &c. &c.; arms glittering in *the sun*, and banners waving in the AIR. It is these pictures and passions from NATURE,[4] and these alone, which make a drum or fife poetical; and let the same drum or fife be heard before a booth in a fair, or in a regiment with *wooden* guns, and this poetical effect will be lost. I therefore turn your own instances against you.

What I said respecting descriptive poetry, in my Essay on the

---

[1] A London critic, in the Quarterly Review, says, he knows nothing of Nature, external, moral, or general! I believe him.

[2] As Mr. D'Israeli has taken such antipathy to "NATURE," I have left out the word, where the sense could be understood without it.

[3] Lord BYRON'S argument is a verbal quibble on "*Take away.*" The sense will be obvious, though it is true, if there were no sea, there would be no ships!! But the *chief poetical beauty* is nevertheless derived from Nature, according to Mr. CAMPBELL'S own *description*.

[4] To distinguish from local and artificial manners.

Poetical Character of Pope, was not with a view of showing that a poet should be a botanist, or even a Dutch painter; but that no one could be "*pre-eminent,*" as a great (*descriptive*) poet, without this knowledge, which peculiarly distinguishes Cowper and Thomson. The objects I had in view, when I used the expressions objected to, were *Pope's Pastorals* and *Windsor Forest.* I will appeal to your own quotation from the first of these poets. Why is Cowper so eminent as a descriptive poet? for I am now speaking of this part of his poetical character alone. Because he is the most accurate describer of the works of *external nature,* and for that reason is superior, as a *descriptive poet,* to Pope.[1] Every tree, and every peculiarity of color and shape, are so described, that the reader becomes a spectator, and is doubly interested with the truth of coloring, and the beauty of the scene, so vividly and so delightfully painted; and you yourself have observed the same in your criticism on this exquisite poet, in WORDS AS DECISIVE AS MY OWN.

Having thus merely stated my sentiments in general, as they stand in order and connexion in the Essay on the Poetic Character of Pope, I shall now pursue your arguments more in detail.

You say, "as the subject of *inspired* fiction, *nature includes artificial* forms and *manners.*" "Richardson is no less a painter of nature than Homer!" I will not stoop to notice your vague expression of "*inspired fiction;*" but will admit that Richardson is not less a painter of nature than Homer. For, indeed, Richardson,

> Irritat, mulcet, falsis terroribus implet,
> Ut magus!

But let us take Clarissa Harlowe, the most affecting of Richardson's "inspired fictions!" Though Lovelace be a character in ARTIFICIAL LIFE, the interest we take in the history of Clarissa is derived from PASSIONS. Its great characteristic is PATHOS; and this I have distinguished as a far more essential property of poetry than flowers and leaves! The passions excited make Richardson so far, and no farther, poetical. There is nothing poetical in the feathered hat or the sword-knot of Lovelace; nor in the gallant but *artificial* manners of this accomplished villain. In Sir Charles Grandison the character of Clementina is *poetical,* and for the same reasons; but there is nothing very *poetical* in Sir Charles himself, or "the venerable Mrs. Shirley!"

I must here observe, that when I speak of passions as poetical, I speak of those which are most elevated or pathetic; for it is true, passions are described[2] in Terence as well as Sophocles; but

---

[1] Mr. Campbell's own quotation will be seen in the Postscript.

[2] This is the reason why I used the expression of *passions* derived from *manners.*

I confine my definition to what is *heroic, sublime, pathetic*, or *beautiful*, in human feelings; and this distinction is kept in view through the Essay on the Poetic Character of POPE. SHAKSPEARE displays the same wonderful powers in Falstaff as in Lear, but not the same *poetical* powers; and the provinces of comedy and tragedy will be always separate; the one relating to the passions, the other combined with the *passing fashions*, and incidental variations of the "Cynthia of the minute."

To proceed; you say, "HOMER himself is a minute describer of the works of art!" But are his descriptions of works of art *more* poetical than his descriptions of the great feelings of nature? Nay, the whole of the Odyssey derives its peculiar charm from the scenes of NATURE; as the Iliad does from its loftier passions. But do you really think that the catalogue of the Grecian ships is as *poetical* as the animated horses of Achilles; and do you think HOMER would have been so great a poet, if he had been only a minute describer of works of art? Jejune as the catalogue of the leaders and ships is, how much *more* interesting and poetical is it rendered by the brief interpositions of varied and natural landscape; and it is this very circumstance that gives the dry account any interest at all. Besides, was the age of HOMER an æra of refinement or *artificial* life? by whom not even such a *poetical work* of *art* as a *bridge* is mentioned![1]

But RICHARDSON and HOMER are not sufficient to overwhelm me and my hypothesis; and it is remarked, as if the argument were at once *decisive*, that MILTON is full of imagery derived from art; "Satan's spear," for example, is compared to the "MAST OF SOME GREAT AMMIRAL!" Supposing it is, do you really think that such a comparison makes the description of Satan's spear a whit *more poetical*? I think *much less* so. But MILTON was not so unpoetical as you imagine, though I think his simile does not greatly add to our poetical ideas of Satan's spear! The "mast of the great admiral" might have been left out; but remark, in this image MILTON DOES NOT compare Satan's spear "*with the mast of some great admiral*," as you assert. The passage is,

---

[1] Mr. CAMPBELL asks me if γεφυρας might not signify a bridge: I answer, it may signify any thing that connects the two banks of a river: but he is very welcome to the bridge, and it shall be as beautiful in architecture as Westminster bridge, if he likes: Yet what will it serve him respecting the main argument? which was, that HOMER lived in an age before the existence of works of the highest perfection in art; so his Jupiter, Apollo, and Neptune, and his most exquisite delineations of scenes of nature, and forms of gods, and passions of the heart, could not have been derived from those *secondary* sources of intellectual delight.

"His spear, to equal which the TALLEST PINE
HEWN ON NORWEGIAN HILLS TO BE the mast
Of some great ammiral, were but a wand!!"

You leave out the chief, I might say the only, circumstance which reconciles the "mast" to us; and having detruncated MILTON's image, triumphantly say, "MILTON is full of imagery derived from art!!" You then advance, "*dextrâque sinistrâque*," and say, not only Satan's spear is compared to an "*admiral's mast*," but "*his shield to the moon seen through a telescope!*"

My dear Sir, consider a little. You forget the passage; or have purposely left out more than half of its essential poetical beauty. What reason have I to complain, when you use MILTON thus? I beseech you recollect MILTON's image.

"His pond'rous shield
Hung on his shoulders like the moon, whose orb
Through optic glass the Tuscan artist views
At EVENING, FROM THE TOP OF FESOLE,
Or in VALDARNO, to DESCRY NEW LANDS,
RIVERS, OF MOUNTAINS, IN HER SPOTTY GLOBE."

Who does not perceive the art of the poet in introducing, besides the telescope, as if conscious how unpoetical it was in itself, all the circumstances from NATURE, *external nature*,—the evening—the top of Fesole—the scenes of Valdarno—and the LANDS, MOUNTAINS, and RIVERS, in the moon's orb? It is these which make the passage poetical, and not the *telescope!!*

Whilst I am on this subject, let me point out a grand and sublime passage of this great poet, in which images *from art* are most successfully introduced, and made most highly poetical. The passage I allude to is in the Paradise Regained—the picture of Imperial Rome.

"On each side an Imperial city stood,
With TOW'RS and TEMPLES proudly elevate
On seven small hills, with PALACES adorn'd,
PORCHES, and THEATRES, BATHS, AQUEDUCTS,
STATUES, and TROPHIES, and TRIUMPHAL ARCS,
GARDENS, and GROVES, presented to his eyes,
Above the height of mountains interpos'd," &c.——
"The CITY which thou see'st, no other deem
Than GREAT and GLORIOUS Rome, QUEEN of the EARTH
So far renowned, and with the spoils enrich'd
Of nations; there the CAPITOL thou see'st,
Above the rest, lifting his stately head
On the Tarpeian rock, her citadel
Impregnable, and there Mount Palatine,
The Imperial palace, compass huge, and high,
The structure, skill of noblest architects,
With GILDED BATTLEMENTS, CONSPICUOUS far,
TURRETS, and TERRACES, and GLITTERING SPIRES," &c.
"Thence to the gates cast round thine eye, and see
What conflux issuing forth, or ent'ring in,

PRÆTORS, PROCONSULS to their provinces
Hasting, or on return, in robes of state,
LICTORS, and RODS, the ensigns of their power,
Legions, and cohorts, turms of horse and wings,
Or embassies from regions far remote,
In various habits on the Appian road,
Or on th' Emilian," &c.

This truly grand and most poetical picture I here gratuitously set before you, convinced as you must now, I think, be, of the weakness of your telescope, and admiral's mast! And with the impression left on the imagination by this lofty and beautiful assemblage, drawn chiefly from art, but mixed up in a grand and impressive picture, by MILTON's consummate powers of painting, I will still contend, that "images drawn from what is BEAUTIFUL and SUBLIME in NATURE, are *more poetical* than images drawn from art."

I cannot dismiss this part of the subject, and the "launching of the ship," which I have already touched on, without quoting your own animated description.

"Those who have ever witnessed the spectacle of the launching of a ship of the line, will, perhaps, forgive me for adding this to the examples of the sublime objects of artificial life. Of that spectacle I can never forget the impression.

"When the vast bulwark sprung from her cradle, the CALM WATER on which she swung MAJESTICALLY round, gave the IMAGINATION a contrast of the STORMY ELEMENT, on which she was soon to ride. All the days of battle, and nights of danger, she had to encounter; all the ENDS of the EARTH which she had to visit; and all that she had to do and suffer for her country, rose in awful presentiment before the mind; and when the heart gave her a benediction, it was like one pronounced on a *living being!!*" Now let me ask you, when you so beautifully described this ship, why was it necessary to describe its LAUNCHING at all? If images derived from art are as beautiful and sublime as those derived from nature, why was it necessary to bring your ship *off the stocks?* It was complete, as far as art was concerned, before; it had the same sails, the same streamers, and the same tackle. But surely your own illustration is decidedly in my favor, when it appears, from this animated description, to make the object of art so poetically interesting, you are obliged to have recourse to NATURE!

This circumstance, confirms my doubt, whether you ever really read my estimate of POPE's Poetical Character. Even if I had been less explicit, could you suppose that, when I used the expression of general nature, I meant to confine the idea that expression conveyed, to *external* nature alone?

You observe, in page 264 of your first volume of Specimens of British Poets, that "Nature is the poet's goddess; but by nature no one rightly understands her mere inanimate face, however charming it may be; or the simple landscape painting of trees, clouds, precipices, and flowers. Why then try POPE, or any other poet EXCLUSIVELY BY HIS POWERS OF DESCRIBING inanimate phænomena? Nature, in the wide and proper sense of the word, means life in all its circumstances—nature MORAL as well as external."—*Campbell's Specimens.*

Have I ever tried POPE by the exclusive power of painting *inanimate phænomena?* Have I ever denied that Nature, in the proper sense of the word, means Nature *moral* as well as external? Have I not, in the very first sentences of the observations on POPE's Poetical Character, said nearly the same thing? Could this utterly escape your notice, if you had (I will not say read the *criticism,*) but only *looked* at the two first sentences?

To set before you, in one view, your palpable perversions of my positions, I will briefly state the course of my argument, and your representation of it. The plain course of my argument was simply this:—1st. *Works of Nature,* speaking of those *more* beautiful and sublime, are *more* sublime and beautiful than works of Art; therefore more poetical.—2d. The passions of the human heart, which are the same in all ages, and which are the causes of the sublime and pathetic in sentiment, are more *poetical* than *artificial manners.*—3d. The great poet of human passions is the most consummate master of his art; and the heroic, the lofty, and the pathetic, as belonging to this class, are distinguished.—4th. If these premises be true, the descriptive poet, who paints from an intimate knowledge of external nature, is more poetical, supposing the fidelity and execution equal, *not* than the painter of human passions, but the painter of external circumstances in *artificial life;* as COWPER paints a morning walk, and POPE a game of cards!

This is the ground of my argument; and your representation, leaving out the most essential part, is this: "He alone is a poet who paints from works of external nature; and his knowledge of external nature must be as minute as that of a botanist and Dutch painter!"[1] I appeal to your book; and if this were not the mutilated representation of my argument, you would never have thought it necessary to say that SOPHOCLES was a GREAT POET, notwithstanding there is no minute painting of "leaves," &c. in Philoctetes! I have here given a short analysis of my argument, and your *mutilation* of it; on which mutilation alone you build your *answer.* For, indeed, you have totally left out the middle of my argument, and ludicrously joined the head and the legs, like the PICTURE of NOBODY in the London shops.

If this be so, I ask you whether you do not think I have some reason to make this remonstrance? You leave out the most material part of my proposition; and, taking a sentence relating to another point in *another* place, you separate it from its direct application, and misapply it to that with which it had no relation; omitting what was connected and even consecutive, and *connecting* what was neither the one nor the other.

---

[1] Yet Mr. Campbell has not misrepresented me! he says.

The minute knowledge of *external* nature, which I laid down as one essential of a great descriptive poet, you apply to *tragedians*, in whose more elevated works (the subjects of which are the loftier passions of *general* nature) descriptions of *external* nature ought least of all to have place. But perhaps I ought to thank you for thus bringing me back to the delightful remembrance of the most interesting studies of my youth,—the tragedies of SOPHOCLES, and particularly the Sperchian fountains, the Lemnian rock, and the solitary cave of Philoctetes. Nor can I forget, that one of the companions of my youthful studies, now in the dust, made this melancholy abode the subject of one of the most beautiful, and affecting, and picturesque sonnets in the English language: the insertion of which in your next edition,[1] would be, I am persuaded, far more acceptable than many specimens you have admitted.

To return to SOPHOCLES. There is no minute description of leaves and flowers; but you have forgotten that the affecting story of the desolate Philoctetes displays not only the higher passions, but exhibits the interesting display of many of nature's external beauties, of her most romantic scenery, of her most secluded solitudes. It is many years since I read the play; but recollecting its wild poetic scenery, and impassioned language, I repeated, *with a sigh*,

> *Νυν δ', ω κρηναι, γλυκιον τε ποτον,*
> *Λειπομεν υμας, λειπομεν ηδη,*
> *Δοξης ουποτε τησδ' επιβαντες.*
> *Χαιρ', ω Λημνου πεδον αμφιαλον,* &c.

It is the rocks, the caves, the wild and solitary scenery, the desert island, and the surrounding seas, all images of nature, that, mixed with the language of human passions derived from the same general nature, give this ancient and unique drama its peculiar charm; reminding us of the romantic imagery in the Tempest and Midsummer Night's Dream, so beautifully interwoven by SHAKSPEARE in those interesting dramas.

The miserable abode of the lonely inhabitant of Lemnos is marked by one image drawn from art, which is so minute, and sets so strongly before us the wants and resources of the desolate exile, that none of the minute circumstances which render so natural the narrative of Robinson Crusoe, can be imagined more affecting. I allude to the

---

[1] Written by the Rev. THOS. RUSSELL, of New College, Oxford.

Αυτοξυλον γ' εκπωμα φαυλουργου ου τινος
Τεχνηματ' ανδρος,

in the cave of Philoctetes. There is nothing poetical in an ill-carved cup; but in this place it is rendered poetical, and most strikingly affecting, by the associated circumstances.

In the quotation from SHAKSPEARE, where you triumphantly appeal to the "*towers,* and solemn *temples,* and *gorgeous palaces,*" recollect, Sir, the tower is "*cloud-capt;*" the temple is associated with the "solemnity" of religious awe; and "*palaces*" with the splendor of earthly magnificence: and all these images are brought into one grand and awful picture, to show the mighty devastation of final ruin; and are associated with that leading idea of the destruction of the *globe* itself, which will leave not a WRECK behind! Thus the "*cloud-capt towers*" become highly poetical; nor can I leave this point without speaking a word of the particular object of the tower. POPE himself has thought its image so pleasing, that, in the catalogue of ships from HOMER, he sets before us the prospect of English spires, not Grecian. If the "cloud-capt tower" itself be a striking, and often a beautiful, object; how much more poetical, when, grey with years, or illumined by the setting sun, it carries the thought to that worship with which it is connected, the sabbaths of our forefathers; or harmonizes with the soft, sinking landscape of evening, and the ideas of another world.

If ever I should have the pleasure of seeing you in this county, in which I should sincerely rejoice, not far from my own house I could show you a tower which is "cloud-capt,"[1] but *not* poetical; though it is of the same size with other towers, and adorned with pinnacles. It is what is called a *sham* tower, built in all respects like other towers as to *one side,* but it is only a wall built in this shape, and added to a cottage for the sake of a view, from the poetical and picturesque terrace of an ancient Abbey. To take you to scenes with which you are better acquainted. I would ask you, what makes the venerable towers of Westminster Abbey, on the side of the Thames, more poetical, as objects, than the tower for the manufactory of *patent shot,* surrounded by the same scenery, and *towering* amidst the smoke *of the city?*

But, enough of this! I have read your observations with greater attention than you could have read mine; and having so read them, I must confess I do not find one point established against those positions which I had distinctly laid down, unless your observations may be called an answer, where, in refutation of such plain positions, you repeat yourself.

---

[1] The evening or morning has the same effect on this tower as any other; but describe it in poetry, you *must keep out of sight* that it is "*sham,*" otherwise all poetical associations will be *lost.*—*See Letter to Lord Byron.*

There is another circumstance, which almost persuades me you never read my criticism on POPE's Poetic Character. You say, "He glows with passion in the Epistle of Eloisa; and displays a lofty feeling, much *above* that of the satirist and man of the world, in his prologue to Cato, and his Epistle to Lord OXFORD." —*Campbell.*

This may be called an "answer!" how complete an answer it is, will be shown by the following few lines of my criticism: "We regret that we have little more truly pathetic from his pen than the Epistle of Eloisa; and the Elegy to the unfortunate Lady; yet let me not forget one of the sweetest and most melodious of his pathetic effusions, the Address to Lord OXFORD,

"Such were the notes my once-lov'd Poet sung."

Bowles.

I must again entreat pardon for showing what I did say of a poem founded on *manners*, and what I did *not* say of the Rape of the Lock. "In this composition POPE stands alone, unrivalled, and possibly never to be rivalled. All his successful labor of correct and musical versification, all his talents of accurate description, though in an inferior province of poetry, are here consummately displayed; and as far as artificial life, that is, '*manners*,' not PASSIONS, are capable of being rendered poetical, they are here rendered so by the fancy, the propriety, the elegance, and the poetic beauty of the machinery."

Now I would put to you a few plain questions; and I would beseech you not to ask whether I *mean* this or that, for I think you must now understand *what I do mean.* I would beseech you also not to write *beside* the *question*, but answer simply and plainly, whether you think that the sylph of POPE, "trembling over the fumes of a chocolate-pot," be an image as poetical as that of the delicate and quaint Ariel, who sings "Where the bee sucks, there lurk I?" Or of the elves of SHAKSPEARE:

"———— Spirits of another sort,
"That with the morning light make sport."

Whether you think the description of a game of cards be as *poetical*, supposing the execution in the artists equal, as a description of a WALK in a FOREST? Whether an age of refinement be as conducive to pictures of poetry, as a period less refined? Whether passions, affections, &c. of the human heart be not a higher source of what is pathetic or sublime in poetry, than habits or manners, that apply only to artificial life? If you agree with me, I am satisfied; if not, we differ, and always shall, on the principles of poetical *criticism.*

Your last observation is this: "I know not how to designate the possessor of such gifts, but by the name of genuine poet."

Nor do I, nor did I ever; and I will venture to assert, that if you examine well what I have here said on POPE's several writings, you will not think I ever showed reluctance to attribute to him that high name.

Again. You say, "POPE's discrimination lies in the lights and shades of '*human*' *manners*, which are at least as interesting as *those of rocks and leaves!*" Does it require more than the commonest understanding to perceive the *fallacy* of this language.

I fear it would be thought impertinent to ask you at what University you acquired your logic; but I guess your knowledge of the art was not acquired at Oxford. Your logic is this: "*Human manners* are the province of poets;" therefore, "the *general* and *loftier passions* are *not more* poetical than *manners of artificial life*." Shall I hint further, that the expression *human manners* is vague and inapplicable. *Human* manners may designate equally the red Indian, in the forests of the Mississippi; the plumed soldier, and the grey-haired minstrel of chivalry; or Beau Nash, in a Bath ball-room. Every comedy, every farce, has *human* manners; but my proposition was confined to *manners* of a *refined* age, which I called artificial; and which you have *artificially* slurred over with irrelevant expressions, that prove nothing. Artificial manners are *human*, but "*human manners*" ARE NOT SO ADAPTED TO POETRY OF THE HIGHEST KIND AS HUMAN PASSIONS.

I beg further to say, that there is not one passage, concerning the poetical beauties of which you have so justly spoken, which I have not expressly pointed out myself, as the reader may find in turning to the passages; particularly let him remember what I have said respecting the PATHOS, and the PICTURES, and the SOLEMN and SWEET HARMONIES, in the Epistle of Eloisa. And can I help pointing out, *not with triumph*, but with regret, that you only *agree with me* in some points, and that where we differ, your criticism conflictingly labors against your own argument? for when, nearly in the last sentence, you say, "he, POPE, *glows with passion* in the Eloisa, and displays a LOFTY feeling, much ABOVE that of the SATIRIST and man of the world, in his Prologue to Cato, and his Epistle to Lord OXFORD;" what is that but to say, that "glowing passions and *lofty feelings* are much ABOVE those which distinguish the SATIRIST and man of the world!!" Q. E. D.

AN

ADDRESS

TO

THOMAS CAMPBELL, ESQ.

Editor of the New Monthly Magazine,

In Consequence of an Article in that Publication.

Bremhill, March 14, 1822.

DEAR SIR,

I ASSURE you it was only yesterday that I accidentally saw, in the Magazine, of which you are the Editor, an article professedly reviewing a pamphlet, in which a *late controversy* is spoken of. The article in the Magazine, if not written, which I can *hardly* suppose, by the Editor, has, at least, his sanction, and therefore is entitled to some notice.

1st. I am happy it is admitted that I spoke of "passions" in my definition of poetry.

> Est quodam prodire tenus si non datur ultra.

No misunderstanding could have taken place, between me and yourself, if this had been originally admitted; because I could not have been represented as confining my views of poetry to Dutch pictures and inanimate landscapes.

2d. It being admitted that I had spoken of "*passions,*" and that you had represented me as omitting them, I am very willing that your representation of my sentiments shall not be called *misrepresentation,* if there be any other term.[1]

Whether the sentence in which "passions" are spoken of as "*derived*" from "manners," be verbally accurate or not, the main drift of the argument is not affected by it; which is, whether *art* or *nature, passions* or *manners,* are most susceptible of the highest poetical effects, or, in other words, "are more adapted to the highest orders of poetry," which is my proposition.

---

[1] Mr. C. had originally quoted, but omitted to make any use of, Mr. BOWLES's second position.

A *third* edition of the Letters to Lord BYRON being about to appear, I shall have an opportunity of making some further remarks respecting the sentiments which come under the sanction of Mr. CAMPBELL.

As to the writer reviewed in the New Monthly Magazine, to pass over the eternal *quibbles*, "*splitting hairs*" about *words*; his writing "about it, Goddess, and about it;" to pass over his "proving" what I never denied, and assuming what I never asserted; his reasonings appear to me *ne plus ultra absurdities* in any man who can read and write.

Third and lastly; when he speaks of HOMER as introducing images from art, I would ask, "Te judice," whether those passages, through the whole of the Iliad or Odyssey, are *more* poetical, whose chief beauty depends on images from ART or NATURE? Yes or no? If you say, "the passages *are more* poetical that describe images from nature, and *passions*, than those that describe *art*, you AGREE with me!" Can you venture to say the contrary?

I would ask you another question.

Why could not so great and poetical a genius as VIRGIL, have made his *top* as poetical as his JUPITER, (media nimborum in nocte,) if the sublimity of any object depended solely on the *genius* of the *describer?*

Whatever verbal cavils may be made, I am quite sure the immoveable foundation of these principles cannot be shaken, either by yourself or Lord BYRON, if the question be met fully and fairly; and after all, if you should succeed, you will destroy, not my principles, but the principles of common sense, the acknowledged foundation of all sound criticism, from LONGINUS to Dr. JOHNSON. I will be enough to say, that, looking to the authority of POPE himself, and to him alone, if these principles are not sound, the line of the Essay on Criticism, describing nature as

> The source, the end, the test of art,

was meant by POPE as burlesque, and the "song" by a *person of quality,*

> "NATURE must give way to ART,"

as serious;—which is reductio ad absurdum, or rather absurdum *per absurdius*.

Be assured I never was "*angry* with you."—How *could* I be? You had never used the language of vulgar insult, nor even incivility; you had unintentionally *omitted*, what I thought it necessary;

in my definition of poetry, to lay down, and I thought it right to show this; and you had spoken of *art*, without *reflecting*, apparently, that images from *art* in poetry, are rendered *more* poetical from their *moral* associations, or connexion with the external beauties of nature.

I should certainly have thought it would have been more manly and generous in the Editor of the New Monthly Magazine, to have stated Lord Byron's arguments, and my answers, briefly but substantially,—or his own arguments, and *my answers*, and his own fair answers to *them*,—instead of tacking his opinions to *ex parte* statements of a writer, whose ingenuity consists chiefly in elaborate verbal cavils.

Now, my good Sir, it will not avail you to say, that no one object is *more poetical*, (that is, more adapted to poetry) than another; it signifies little to assert and build a baseless theory upon an opinion, that I ever said "the *subject* of a poem constitutes its *merit more than the genius* of the *author*;" it is unfair to affirm that I said *subject* was all, when I affirmed that *execution* must be taken into consideration. It is unjust to cavil on the words "taken into consideration," when it is clear from the context that the words imply "taken into consideration, before you can estimate the rank of a poet in his art;" it won't do to cavil about the words sublime and poetical, when, if the subject be poetry, every one will know that the sublime, beautiful, or picturesque, or pathetic, must be applied to poetry. It won't do to say, that the sea, the sun, &c. have no sublimity in themselves, but that it depends on the treatment; for I then appeal to those who *have* best described them. It won't do to say they are nothing *in themselves;* for even by itself, without an adjunct, the *sea* is *more* poetical, (more *adapted* to poetry) than any *canal*. It won't do to affirm, or to pretend to "*prove*," that one subject is not more adapted to poetry than another; for then Virgil could have made his "*plough*," in the Georgic, as poetic, at least, as he has made his "*serpent*." It is of no use to talk of the "*no less exquisite performances of* GENIUS *in* WORKS *of* ART," without defining what *that genius is*. It won't do to assert there is nothing sublime or beautiful in nature, abstractedly considered, when, though a bad poet like Blackmore might undo "*Creation at a jerk*," yet the best poet could not make a "*mouse-trap*" sublime.

This appears to me the substance of the arguments which you think, as editor of a Magazine, CONVINCING!!

Now, my good Sir, ponder these things a little before you put forward your metaphysical coadjutor.

I owe to yourself to pay some more particular attention to arguments which I should otherwise think unworthy of notice.—In the first page it is said *mine* is a *new poetic* theory.—Answer: it is as old as common sense. 2d page, it is said, "the creations and associations of poetry are addressed to the *imaginations* and *feelings alone*."—Quere: How many of POE's poems are addressed to the *imagination* and *feelings* alone? Ibid: It is said "the influence of poetry is *confined* to the *heart* and *affections alone!*" Quere: How many of the poems of POPE are *confined* to the *heart* and *affections alone?*

This is quite enough for me, who ask only, and never did ask more, than THESE DATA; and upon these (for my opponents *blunder* in my favor, the first step, when they thought to destroy my theory,) DATA alone, I assert, MILTON and SHAKESPEARE are far greater Poets than POPE was, or ever could be, in his *line* of poetry.

In a most popular periodical publication, one of BLACKWOOD'S clever wags says, "What can Lord BYRON and CAMPBELL mean, by saying art and manners are as poetical as nature? It is all my eye, Betty *Martin!*" Could the writer have in prophetical view, or what is called "second sight," this identical *Martinus* secundus? You probably might have heard, that the familiar expression is from an old hymn, "*Mihi* Beate *Martine !!!*"

As to making "the hog in the wind" a *sublime* object, neither Lord BYRON nor POPE could do it, any more than they could make, in the vulgar phrase, "a *silk purse* of a *sow's ear!*"[1] For yourself, I am sorry to be compelled to observe, that, by so ostentatiously bringing forward absurdities, and approving a mode of controversy you must despise, you appear to me to have added something like *intentional* insult to *unintentional* misrepresentation. Nevertheless, without the least feelings of "*anger,*"

I remain, dear Sir, &c.

W. L. BOWLES.

---

[1] A Cockney critic and poet, seeing a countryman going to a market-town behind the animals of which he had the charge, wrapt in the pastoral ideas of "*Arcadia*," put an eye-glass to his eye, and said to the countryman, "Friend, what *sheep* are those?" 'Sheep!' the man replied; 'where dost *thee* come from, not to know a *sheep* from a *pig?*'

I am afraid all the great geniuses of Cockney-land could not make a very poetical *pig-pastoral*, however they might succeed in "*sentimental*" and amorous *swans*, of which there is an affecting description in certain comical histories, called "*Romances*," by J. D'ISRAELI, Esq.

On the Question, whether, in Poetical Criticism, the "SUBJECT" *of a Poem should be considered as well as the* "EXECUTION."

THE words of Mr. CAMPBELL'S Oracle, in his first page, (for we "must speak by the card, or equivocation will ensue,") are these: "he *trusts* that neither the REVOLUTIONS of EMPIRE, nor the circumstances of literature, will ever lead men to believe that the subject of a poem constitutes MORE of its poetical excellency than it derives from the genius of the poet!"

But, reader, perpend—

In "the REVOLUTIONS of EMPIRE," who knows, but that (though the philosopher "TRUSTS" it never will be) my portentous propositions may be established; propositions so appalling, as that the sublime and beautiful in nature may be thought superior to *art*, and *passions* may be thought a groundwork of poetry more sure than manners!! What will become of this world, if ever these opinions should prevail? Even the Editor of the New Monthly, and the publisher, and the printer's devil, all aghast, might enter, crying out to the philosopher, whom they advocate,

> "This day, oh! Mr. Doodle, is a day indeed!
> A day we never saw before!!"

But what is the proposition, that this metaphysical Doodle trusts in the revolutions of empire will never take place!—lest, "*horresco referens*," future generations may believe that the *subject* of a poem shall ever CONSTITUTE MORE of its EXCELLENCE than the GENIUS of the poet!! Take heart, poor man; as far as I am concerned you need not be in the least fear!! for my words are,—"we might fall asleep over the Creation of BLACKMORE, but be alive to the touches of animation and satire in BOILEAU. The subject, therefore, and execution, are equally to be considered; the one respecting the poetry, and the other the ART and POWERS of the poet."—[Fifth paragraph of the observations on the Poetic Character of POPE.]

Now, as Mr. CAMPBELL is a man of veracity, I would wish him to ask his metaphysician, why, in a quotation from me, did he leave out the above words I have quoted, *stopping in the middle of the sentence?* Because he knew they stared him in the face, and told you what a "lee that was,"[1] when he said I made no distinction between *the subject* and *manner* of *treating it.*

When the reader looks at my words he will think so too, and be convinced that they were omitted *purposely.* I will not say here, as in some other passages, *Oh! Te, Dermotte, cerebri!* but ask, Where, in the words of that arch wag, FOOTE, do you think you shall *go when you die*, Martin? Further, if one subject be not, *per se*, *more* poetical than another, I would ask Mr. CAMPBELL's oracle this question, Which does his sapience suppose to be the finest subject for tragedy, Macbeth, or "a mouse-trap?"[1] If you say the mouse-trap, the boys, as JOHNSON says, "would throw stones at you!" If you say that Macbeth, as a subject is, *per se*, *more poetical* than the other, we agree! You will reply, "Yes," but one man can write better on the subject of a *mouse-trap*, than the other on Macbeth! Good! So say I, *otherwise* BLACKMORE would be a greater poet than POPE!

---

[1] See that delectable History, "Sir Andrew Wylie."

Stop a minute, and do not leave out what I am going to add; "Suppose SHAKESPEARE himself had made a tragedy on the *mouse-trap*, executed as perfectly as such a pathetic subject of *transcendental art* could be executed by mortal poet, do you think it would be equally poetical as Macbeth?" Why not? Because the subject of one is "*more adapted to the highest orders of poetry*" than the other: so I think,

> ......Nisi quid tu, docte Trebate,
> Dissentis!

I have quoted a specimen of the veracity and ingenuity of this "wonderful" oracle of the New Monthly Magazine, from the *first page*; it is but right to show what this gentleman has achieved, in his own opinion, *from the last page!* He has "*proved*," he says, that there is not a *poetical object* in nature or art!! Proved he has not, and prove he never can; but suppose he has, has he proved *no one object* is *more adapted*, *per se*, to the highest orders of poetry than *another*, for that is my proposition? He has "proved," also, that objects I have called *poetical* have no poetry, abstracted from the manner in which they are associated by the "poet." Even this is not fairly stated: my position is, "Images, &c. from *nature* are, *per se*, *more poetical* than any from *art*!" Take this position as it is, and answer it if you can. Now, if this gentleman, who, coming forward "*for the first time*" so marvellously to illumine the New Monthly Magazine, had read a *little* more, and *wrote* a little less, and paid a *little* attention to the subject on which he was writing, he would then have found, by my own admissions, that what I had said *nullified* one half of his book and *stultified* the other; and proved, on the whole, that, though he can *quibble*, he was as destitute of veracity as of *common sense*.

If ever this gentleman should begin to *read a little*, before he next sends his lucubrations into the world, though *considering* it is the *first time*, he is not the less "*wonderful*," I could venture to point out a passage, which I think he himself must pronounce highly *poetical*, as follows:

---

[1] "What do you call the play?
The Mouse-trap!" *Hamlet.*
"To be *grave* exceeds all power of face!"—*Pope.*

"He was in logic a *great critic*,
Profoundly skill'd in analytic;
He could distinguish and divide
A hair 'twixt south and south-west side:
On either which he would dispute,
Confute, change hands, and still *confute*;
He'd undertake '*to prove*,' by force
Of argument, a man's no horse.
All this, without a gloss or comment,
He could unriddle in a moment,
In proper terms such as men smatter,
When they throw out, and MISS THE MATTER!"

But I must not here pass over one argument, quite new and convincing!!

This acute logician, quibbling on the word "*poetical*," asks, "But if a man's wife be beautiful, should we therefore call her a poetical wife?" A poetical *subject* we might; but Mr. BOWLES would not call a man's *wife poetical*, because she was *beautiful*; for this reason, if the word "poetical," in common *parlance*, be applied "to *reading and writing animals*," it would be understood to imply, that the writing or reading animal was addicted to *read* or *write poetry*, or scribble quibbling criticisms; but if the word *poetical* be applied, in the sense Mr. BOWLES constantly used it, to a *beautiful*, or picturesque object, or to *passions*, far *more poetical* than inanimate objects, in spite of Cockney logic, it would mean that a landscape or tree, the beech that

"Wreaths its old fantastic roots so high,"

was poetical, being adapted to *poetical* description!

Admit it, therefore, to be true, that a beautiful woman would not be called "poetical, because she was beautiful;" Mr. BOWLES has no hesitation to say, that even the "*proser*," '*who penned a stanza when he should engross*," might be called "poetical," though he was as *ugly* as *Grimaldi*, wrote verses worse than TOM DURFEY, and was so ignorant of the beauties of *external nature*, that he never saw even a *potatoe*, except in a wheelbarrow!

As I have mentioned the "nodding beech," I must add that it is a fact, as may be seen in a *London* periodical publication, that the Cockney critic, not conceiving what GRAY could mean by a

"Tree that wreaths its roots so high!"

absolutely indulges his blithe disdain, by imagining "the tree to stand on its head."[1]

If I shall be more particular in this than I intended, it may be excused, as I promise not to answer, or read, one word of this wonderful genius's future lucubrations on the "sublime and beautiful." I would just request him, before he begins, to hear what an "old obsolete dunce," called Dr. SAMUEL JOHNSON, says of the "subject" of an epic poem, in the Life of MILTON.

---

[1] The whole is signed "Calamus;" quere, *Quill* Driver?

PROOFS AND EXAMPLES.

Mr. CAMPBELL's *metaphysician* is too absurd, and too dishonest, to contend with. I shall therefore request Mr. CAMPBELL's attention to the following extracts, and ask, if he admit or deny the truth contained in them. In my opinion, the plain question respecting the "SUBJECT and EXECUTION" of a poem is resolved by them. Let us then hear Dr. JOHNSON:

"I am now to examine PARADISE LOST; a poem which, with respect to DESIGN, may CLAIM the FIRST PLACE, and, with respect to PERFORMANCE, the SECOND, among the productions of the human mind."—*Dr. Johnson.*

I will next beg Mr. CAMPBELL to answer, plainly, if this poem claim the FIRST PLACE, with regard to *design*, and the SECOND with respect to performance, WHY it could be so pronounced? Nay, if MILTON had written *satires*, *moral poems*, *one* most exquisite and pathetic epistle, *one* most exquisite mock-heroic, whatever proofs these might be of his GENIUS, *pro tanto*, could he have been so pronounced, though the satires were the best the world ever saw? I will beg Mr. CAMPBELL to say Yes or No! If he deny what Dr. JOHNSON, and what most men of reflection will say, I think he would find it difficult to prove a counter-position. If he agree with Dr. JOHNSON, the difference on this point between him and me is small indeed. I must come a little closer respecting "SUBJECT," and put Dr. JOHNSON *forward.*

"By the general consent of critics, the *first praise* of GENIUS is due to the writer of an EPIC POEM; for it requires an ASSEMBLAGE OF ALL THE POWERS, which are singly sufficient for other compositions!!"—*Life of Milton.*

Is this good sense, or is it nonsense?

Again:

"The SUBJECT of an epic poem is naturally an event of great importance. That of MILTON is not the destruction of a city, or the foundation of an empire: the SUBJECT is, the Fall of Worlds, the Revolutions of Heaven, &c."—*Life of Milton.*

"Before the GREATNESS displayed by MILTON's poem, all other GREATNESS shrinks away," &c.

"To display the motions and actions of BEINGS thus superior, so far as human reason can examine them, or human imagination represent them, is the task which this MIGHTY POET has UNDERTAKEN and PERFORMED!!"

I place before you these extracts from one whom, I think, as good a judge as *you* can produce. Are the positions sound? Yes, or no. If yes, can POPE, however exquisite his skill, in respect to any thing he has written, be ranked on the same "file" with this "*mighty*" poet? It is almost too absurd to ask the question. POPE's genius is granted, his talents are granted, his execution of what he has done puts this beyond all doubt; but his genius has never undertaken or performed a subject so adapted to the higher orders of poetry; and his EXECUTION, if these premises be true, though consummate, will only place him eminent in his line; and no more in the same walk with MILTON and SHAKESPEARE, than with him whose execution entitled him, among all poets that ever lived, to be pronounced THE FIRST among the lights of the human mind!!

Upon these premises I rest, as far as "*subject*" and *execution* are concerned. And I have only to add that those who, in their blind idolatry, wish to place POPE in the rank of SHAKESPEARE and MILTON, are the "bigots," and "*sectarists*;"[1] not I, who wished only to appreciate, *not depreciate*, his distinctive and characteristic excellence.

On Objects "Sublime and Beautiful" in Nature, abstractedly.

WHETHER there be sublime or beautiful objects in nature, *per se*, or not, (though it appears to me that none but the most metaphysically mad could think otherwise,) there can be no cavil, if I take my pictures from poetry, as to whether what is beautiful, or picturesque, or sublime, be poetical. We will open THEOCRITUS, for the book lies on my table.

Αδυ τι το ψιθυρισμα και α πιτυς, αιπολε, τηνα,
Α ποτι ταις παγαισι μελισδεται.

To say nothing of the music of these lines, we see the landscape, and hear, as it were, the very whisper of the pine hanging over the fountain; though another poet might, from want of taste, or from injudicious selection, or mean additions, even of these very objects make a contemptible daub by "imitating nature abominably;" yet, if the objects had not been picturesque, and so far *adapted* to poetry, Theocritus could not have made the picture so beautiful; and therefore the objects are, *per se*, *poetical*. For if it were true, that this subject had *not* intrinsic poetry *from nature*, Theocritus could have made the subsequent verses as *poetical* as these. Has he done so? No, he *could* not. All the *execution* in the world could not make the next succeeding lines as poetical.

---

[1] I cannot pass over the audacious falsehood of Mr. CAMPBELL's advocate, who can "*prove*" from my propositions, that THOMSON is as great a poet as SHAKESPEARE!! Whereas, I have constantly put all descriptive poetry *least* and *last*; and "passions,"—passions, passions!! *first*. The only way to prevent, if any thing can in future, this audacious perversion, will be to print "*passions*" at the end of every sentence, when I am speaking of external nature.

Every scholar, of any taste and feeling, involuntarily repeats the first passage with delight, and turns as involuntarily from the other. Why? Because the subject of the one is picturesque, and therefore so far poetical; the other is less so, and no *art* or genius in the poet could make it as poetically beautiful.

A lover of "*in-door nature*" who would say that there is nothing in the whole range of art, or of nature, *per se*, more poetical than another, might apply *Αδυ τι το ψιθυρισμα* to the *kitchen bellows*, not omitting, in shining description, the *fire-tongs* and *shovel*: the genius with which these in-door implements, together with the gentle *ψιθυρισμα* of the bellows were described, would probably make them, as poetry, *pari passu* with the landscape of Theocritus, in his opinion!!

I assert, on the contrary, that whatever skill MAY BE EMPLOYED, *some subjects*, *described* by one and the same genius, will be *more* poetical than others, and all men will involuntarily confess it, *cum ventum ad verum est*.

Horace says, (and I have at least such a *dunce* as Horace on my side on more points than one,)

> "Et quæ
> DESPERAT TRACTATA NITESCERE POSSE, RELINQUIT:"

Further; if I were to go for an object, abstractedly poetical, from nature as given by this poet, I would transcribe one line only:

> "Et præceps Anio, et Tiburni lucus.

The next line is

> "Uda mobilibus Pomaria rivis.'

Which of these three pictures are the most poetical,

> "Præceps Anio, Tiburni lucus;"

or the last?

Every one, I think, would say the first; because in the first the eye is fixed on the picturesque torrent of Anio, and the woods of Tivoli; and in the other, to the small artificial rivulets by which the Pomaria were watered. But let us appeal to Pope himself. Who does not remember the celebrated simile paraphrased from Homer:

> "As when the moon, &c.
> O'er heav'n's pure azure sheds, &c."

Now granting, *argumenti causa*, that the moon were, *per se*, no more poetical, that is, adapted to poetry, than a *green cheese*, (which is a *natural* object, an *artificial object*, an object of out-of-door *nature*, and in-door also; and, as Lord BYRON might say, a "*super-natural*," "*super-artificial*" object!) let it be the *green cheese* of POLYPHEMUS, laid by for his beloved GALATEA, could THEOCRITUS, could HOMER, have made a picture of it as poetical as the moon-light simile?

I was going to speak of "*the sun*, in MILTON;" of the stars, where "Hesperus rides brightest;" of the morn; of evening; but

Cynthius aurem vellit.

If what I have said cannot persuade even the most obtuse and blundering metaphysician, that there are some objects in nature *more adapted* to poetry, *per se*, than others; and if this position be denied, that there are some objects in nature more describable, and which *have been* more exquisitely described, than any works of art can be, though described by the greatest genius the world ever saw;—if what I have said be not sufficient to prove this, *no examples* could; and I must rest on these reasons, whether good or bad, for retaining that opinion myself, at least till I shall hear some much better arguments, to the contrary.

These quibbles about the word "poetical," which word, if it affect me, affects *Lord Byron also*, and in the same degree; and the whole *elaborate nonsense*, which Mr. CAMPBELL calls "an Answer," is NULLIFIED in a moment, by only remembering that poetical is *adapted to poetry*.

Yet for the sake of my readers I will canvass some objections a little farther.—No great correspondent feeling is excited in the bare words *ocean*, *sun*, *planet*, *firmament*, because the mind is fixed chiefly on *the word*, as a noun substantive in grammar—*Musa*, *dominus*, *domus*, *cœlum*, *mundus*. Something is added, if I say *dominus jussit*, *mundus patet*, *sol nitet*.

Still, the bare *word*, if it excite a moment's thought, excites ideas that are, and *must* be, *more* poetical than any images from art.

"And GOD said, let there BE LIGHT, and there WAS LIGHT!!" This is sublime, and so thinks as great a critic as Mr. CAMPBELL's. But it could not have been so *poetically sublime*, if the object from which the image is derived, was not abstractedly capable of exciting sublime ideas *more poetical* than any object in works of art. The object is sublime in its magnificence, sublime in its relation to *power*, though such a poet as BLACKMORE could not describe it. One scene in landscape is more picturesque, adapted to painting, than another, though a sign-post painter could not paint it.

If it be *action* that chiefly excites emotion, on which account I think it will appear that what LONGINUS calls "sublime," ARISTOTLE with greater discrimination calls "energetic,"

Ενεργητικον τι——

the object itself must be sublime, and as such adapted to poetry in the first instance. A thousand circumstances may be added to any poetical object to render it still more so by accumulation of accessary "images" that belong to it; thus

To behold the *wand'ring* moon,
Riding, *near* her highest noon,
Like *one* that had been led astray,
Through the heav'ns wide pathless way.

Here are five or six *images*, all in *relation*, and all of the highest poetical interest, rendering more distinct, in action and in glory, *one object*, abstractedly poetical—far more adapted to poetry *than any object in art*. It is thus poetry paints! An object is not merely set before us, but being primarily *adapted to poetry*, it becomes *more* poetical, when it thus shines out amidst the galaxy of its glorious relations; whilst the mind follows with excited attention, and more profound delight.

Perhaps the *Canticle*, in our Common Prayer Book, would best show the poetic sublimity of mere objects of nature upon the simplest scale, called into action.

Oh! ye sun and moon—*Praise ye the Lord.*
Oh! ye winds of GOD—*Praise ye, &c.*
Oh! ye winter and summer—*Praise ye, &c.*
Oh! ye seas and floods—*Praise ye, &c.*

I would merely ask, if any "*artificial*" object in the whole world could *sustain* a like *sublimity* with all these objects? "O ye cities and towns," for instance? Therefore some *objects* are more poetical *(adapted to poetry)* than others; and "what are sublime or beautiful in the works of nature, are *more poetical* than any works of art!" but PASSIONS are more poetical, that is to say, more adapted to the highest orders of poetry, than any visible object in nature or art.

Having taken up this slight examination, in deference to Mr. CAMPBELL, I shall go a step farther. The SUN and the OCEAN, we are told, are *not poetical* in themselves, as all poetry depends on the treatment alone!!

"I have introduced both these objects," the metaphysician proclaims aloud, "in the two following lines, and think you will hardly pronounce them *poetical!*"

"The SUN had risen before we left town;
And we got within *sight* of the OCEAN about five o'clock."

Bravo! However, "the SUN" and "the OCEAN" are something, even here. But my position is, that what is sublime and beautiful in nature is *more* so than any thing in art: so, by your leave, if, for "SUN and OCEAN," I put the artificial objects, a *cock'd-hat*, and the sign of the *Green Gander*, the sentence with the Ocean and Sun would be *more* poetical than the other.

I leave those to whom "*Nature*" is so mysterious, to say which even of these two sentences is most poetical!!

Let Mr. CAMPBELL's wonderful logician, who starts out thus powerful at once, like Minerva from the head of Jupiter, let him go yet higher:

> "The *sun*, *stars*, *planets*, and *firmament*,
> Give *light* to the *ocean* and *earth!*"

He asks "if this be *poetical?*" Answer: *More poetical*, certainly, than

> "The *wax-lights*, the *lustres*, the *sconces*, and the *chandeliers*,
> Give *light* to the *ball-room!!*"

On Poetry derived from Passions; and Instances in which what is sublime or pathetic may be affected by unpoetical treatment.

WE have hitherto been speaking only of visible objects of poetical sublimity in Nature. Though I point to my most material proposition, and say, "passions, passions, passions," are the soul of poetry, it is of no use! It is still asserted that I confine my ideas to *minute* descriptions of external nature! that THOMSON, according to my principles, is a greater poet than SHAKESPEARE!! I shall therefore say a few words concerning poetry derived from its highest source; and shall take the first examples which occur in the volume that contains the sublimest and most poetical images in the world.

"He bowed the heavens, also, and came down; and it was dark under his feet: he rode upon the cherubims, and did fly: he came flying on the wings of the wind."

It was not even in the power of STERNHOLD and HOPKINS to destroy the sublimity of this passage:

> "The LORD descended from above,
> And bow'd the heavens most high;
> And underneath his feet he cast
> The darkness of the sky.
> On cherubs and on cherubim," &c.

Now let us take a poetical passage of the most pathetic kind:— "By the waters of Babylon we sat down and wept, when we remembered thee, oh! Sion."

With regard to the first of these passages, to show how just is the general remark of HORACE,

"Invenias etiam disjecti membra poetæ,"

let the images be disjointed how they will, the images being sublime or magnificent in themselves, you cannot destroy them—you will still find, turning them into prose, the same materials of sublimity, the same *disjecti membra poetæ*. It is exactly the reverse with pathetic poetry. In the Psalm, "by the waters of Babylon," words the most simple, combined with the imagery, excite instantaneous feelings of sympathy.

Such being the sublimity and pathos of those two passages from scripture, let us set these performers, "THOMAS STERNHOLD, JOHN HOPKINS, and others," to work on them. The first passage, as I have said, they could hardly do otherwise than render sublime, though they were themselves entirely unconscious of it. Now let us see what they can make of the *pathetic* verse which I have quoted from the Psalms!

"When as we sat in *Babylon*,
  The rivers *round* about,
All in remembrance of Sion,
  The tears for grief *burst* out!
We hung our harps and *instruments*
  The willow trees upon;
For in this *place*, men, *for their use*,
  Had planted many a one!"

Who does not instantly feel the lameness, the *dilutedness*, the scrannel impotence of the paraphrase?

If I were to adduce one incident more pathetic than another, in the whole world of writings, I should, perhaps, draw an example from the affecting story of "JOSEPH and his brethren." The mind is worked up to the most intense interest, when his brothers stand before JOSEPH, who is unknown to them. What is the first word he utters, after he has told them who he is? "I am Joseph your brother:" he stops not a moment for an answer, but instantly, and as scarce breathing, enquires, "*Does* my FATHER yet live? the OLD MAN, of whom ye spake?" The slightest alteration of these words, so delicate is high-wrought sympathy, would instantly destroy the interest.

One distinction seems to me obvious: by *additions*, and those chiefly from *art*, a passage in which sublime objects occur may be made mean, as by COWLEY and BLACKMORE; though the objects themselves, abstractedly, cannot be made so. *Pathos* may be entirely destroyed by bad treatment, or even altering words; but I affirm, as will be shown afterwards, that no *possible treatment* can make a really *unpoetical* image *poetical*, nor any image from art as sublime as images from nature, or manners as *poetical* as passions, provided the poet be adequate in genius, as MILTON and SHAKESPEARE were; and that, therefore, POPE can never be in the same line with these immortal poets, let his *execution* be what it may; never equal to them in *sublimity*, or in *pathos;* never equally master of our *hearts;* and though equalling in *execution*, *pro tanto*, (*all* his works being considered,) never even *approaching* them in the vastness, richness, copiousness, or affecting beauties, of their several creations.

I have placed, in consequence of the consummate *execution* of his Eloisa, and Rape of the Lock, POPE *before* DRYDEN. But if the "*Flower and the Leaf*" of DRYDEN had been original, this exquisite work of fancy and execution would have weighed down the Rape of the Lock; but in consequence of this unique, original, and exquisite performance, the Rape of the Lock, and the most finished and passionate Epistle of Eloisa, infinitely superior to any thing of the kind extant, I have ventured to place POPE above DRYDEN, notwithstanding the superiority of DRYDEN's Ode. And yet, with this printed and published decision, I am held up as considering that he who could write a "*sonnet to a lapdog*, is a greater poet than POPE." See a publication called "The Speculum!"

Such is the periodical press in the year 1822!! Some writers, having been beat out of asserting that I called "POPE no great poet," turn round and say, if I allow his exquisite Eloisa to be so pathetic, and pathos to be one of the great characteristics of the higher orders of poetry, why not place him with SHAKESPEARE? Because "one swallow does not make a summer:" and *what* comparison is there between Eloisa and Lear?

VIRGIL'S GEORGICS; *and whether what is mean, per se, can be rendered poetical by any art of the Poet.*

Mr. CAMPBELL, in the New Monthly Magazine, professes to call the arguments I have examined, an *answer* to me!! This luminous coadjutor of Mr. CAMPBELL has "proved" that the most insignificant creatures, swarming bees, may, in the hands of Virgil, become *sublime*, the whole poetical sublimity, or beauty, depending upon the describer!! As he adduces the very respectable authority of such a scholar as Mr. KNIGHT, I shall be more particular.

All creatures that *fly*, may, I think, as I have before observed, be generally pronounced poetical. How exquisitely has Spencer set before us the clown brushing away the flies on a summer evening! It is the air, the flowers, herbs, the broken hum in the sunshine, that make these objects poetical; as the wild rocks—the daring flight—the eye of fire—make the "*fulminis alitem,*" the most poetically sublime among birds.

It may be further observed, that birds become more poetical according to the places where they chiefly inhabit, associated feelings, &c. Hence, rock-birds, sea-birds, birds of the desert, are poetical; in the solitary woodland, Philomel sings

"Most musical, most melancholy;"

and VIRGIL as beautifully describes the murmurs of the wild dove on the elm,

"Nec gemere aeria cessabit turtur ab ulmo."

All these circumstances enhance the poetical interest. The cuckoo is associated with spring; the vulture with rocks and tempests; the redbreast with the sacred associations of the dead,—

"The Redbreast oft, at evening hours,
Shall kindly lend its little aid,
With scatter'd moss and gather'd flow'rs,
To deck the ground where thou art laid."

Why is this last picture so affecting? because it is strongly and beautifully connected with human sympathy. The observation leads to an infinitude of examples, independent of the flowers, the air, the sunshine, the beautiful forms which birds possess. But let me turn from these poetical objects to a toad in a garden! Who can make a *sublime,* pathetic, or beautiful toad? Though such an object might be in sympathy with *certain characters* that shall be *nameless,* who can make a toad poetical? You must connect with it feelings of dislike and aversion:

"*Squat at the ear of Eve,* familiar toad." MILTON.
....................."Familiar toad,
Half froth, half venom, spits itself abroad." POPE.

If these images be introduced, it is to excite aversion; but the sympathy with what is great, or delightful, or beautiful, is the foundation of the *higher orders* of poetry.

VIRGIL could not make a *harrow* as poetical as a waterfall, or dignify that unpoetical reptile which, in a garden, better associates itself with the ideas of a CRITIC than with poetry, as the *Editor of the Quarterly Review* has once happily observed, in his answer to the Critical Review, on his admirable translation of JUVENAL!!!

To return to the "*sublime*" insects! If they fly,[1] they are *poetical.* Take even the beetle:

---

[1] It is said that I should prefer "FLYING ' with supreme dominion!" I should prefer "SAILING!" for, if the artificer made the *sails,* he did not make "the *winds!*"

[1] See GRAY's Progress of Poetry.

> "Save where the beetle wheels his drony flight." *Gray.*
>
> "Against the traveller borne in heedless hum." *Collins.*

Reptiles exciting *terror* for that reason may be made highly poetical. So in VIRGIL's Georgics:

> "Postquam exusta palus, terræque ardore dehiscunt,
> Exilit in siccum, et flammantia lumina torquens
> Sævit agris."

Again,

> "Cum positis novus exuviis nitidusque juventa
> Volvitur, aut catulos tectis aut ova relinquens,
> Arduus ad solem et linguis micat ora trisulcis."

But no "*treatment*" can make the bee "*sublime!*" Poetic sublimity is not its character, but poetic *beauty* is: and first, let the "most sluggish of the Dunciad tribe" answer, is a bee a *natural* or *artificial* object?

> "Ergo, ubi *ver nactæ sudum camposque patentes,*
> *Erumpunt portis; concurritur; æthere in alto*
> *Fit sonitus, magnum mistæ glomerantur in orbem,*
> *Præcipitesque cadunt.* Non densior *aëre grando,*
> Nec de concussa tantum pluit ilice *glandis.*"

This is *beautiful,—inest sua gratia* PARVIS;—but all the poets in the world cannot make the imagery *sublime.* It is beautiful by nature; a consummate poet avails himself of that *beauty;* so THEOCRITUS,

> *Ωδε καλον βομβευντι ποτι σμανεσσι μελισσαι. . .*
> *Πωτῶντο ξουθαι περι πιδακας αμφὶ μελισσαι.*

And observe, in the passage from the Georgics, the images from *nature!* "*Ver sudum—campos patentes—æthere in alto,*" &c. &c. From his vagrant labors, his life among the flowers, in the sunshine of spring, over the fields, or when

> "With early wing,
> He murmurs the blossom'd trees among;"

from his airy hum, his rich colors in the light, the bee is peculiarly poetical, and its introduction accompanied necessarily with poetical circumstances. VIRGIL, therefore, could give a poetical interest to bees, and even to the snake! Could he do so to the *instrument of art,* employed more especially upon the subject of his poem,—the plough, or any of its *artificial* accessaries? Let the reader see.

> "Curvi formam accipit ulmus aratri;
> Huic à stirpe pedes temo protentus in octo,
> Binæ aures, duplici aptantur dentalia dorso."

Nay, with all the poetry VIRGIL has thrown on his subject, and that poetry from *nature,* (as POPE has done in his Essay on Man,) the Georgics would have lost their most unperishable charm, if he had not shown in his poem the "*dulcia*" as well as the "*pulchra,*" by the exquisite episode of ORPHEUS, &c.

> "Ipse cava solans ægrum testudine amorem,
> Te, dulcis conjux, te solo in littore secum,
> Te veniente die, te decedente canebat.
> Tænarias etiam fauces, alta ostia Ditis,
> Et caligantem nigra formidine lucum
> Ingressus."

Who does not almost involuntarily repeat the rest to

> "Heu non tua, palmas!
> Dixit, et ex oculis subito, ceu fumus in auras," &c.

Need I mention, in farther illustration of the *necessity* of such interspersions in such a work, Aristæus descending into the Deep to see his mother the Sea-Nymph—

> "Jamque domum mirans genetricis, et humida regna,
> Speluncisque lacus clausos, lucosque sonantes,
> Ibat, et, ingenti motu stupefactus aquarum."

Who that reads these passages cares one farthing about the *lætas segetes*, and the plough? and who does not see the art of the poet? and who does not know it is these images from NATURE, from *external* nature and PASSIONS, that make the Georgics, whatever they may be as a treatise on agriculture, ETERNAL AS A POEM?

The only part of the heap of blunders that Mr. CAMPBELL has *puffed*, which has the least claim to any attention from a sensible man, is that taken from Mr. KNIGHT; and which, on that account, I have examined with more respectful attention.

POSTSCRIPT.

As what I have stated in some part of these pages might not be believed without proof, I transcribe literally two passages, one from my Observations, and the other from a Letter to me, by which the reader will see the shifts to which such opponents are reduced.

Passage from my Edition of POPE.

"Let me not be considered as thinking that THE SUBJECT ALONE constitutes poetical excellency, the execution is to be taken into consideration at the same time, for we might fall asleep over the CREATION of BLACKMORE, but be alive to the touches of animation and satire in BOILEAU!"—BOWLES.

"I am aware that *you affect* to assign a *part* of it to execution! Let me not, however, you say, be considered as thinking that the subject constitutes poetical excellency! Here you seem (as usual) to have *studied* AMBIGUITY OF EXPRESSION."—MAC DERMOT, page 44.

The latter limb of the sentence, which puts the meaning out of doubt, is omitted. A full stop is put in the middle of the sentence, for no other reason than that it should appear *ambiguous ;* and then I am boldly accused of purposed ambiguity !!! No reader could believe this, if he had not seen it! and I leave it to speak for itself.

The whole of what this logician " HAS PROVED" is thus summed up:

" I have PROVED that there is nothing poetical in the works of nature or art! I have proved that the objects you *call* poetical have no poetry, abstracted from the manner in which they are associated by the poet; and that where the manner is not poetical, the description will be prosaic, however richly it may be sown with your poetical images; and that consequently in all cases it is the manner alone that constitutes poetical pre-eminence."—Page last.

The first is not "*proved,*" nor can be "*proved,*" unless it can be "*proved*" that no one object is more adapted to poetry than another;—adapted to poetry, being my definition of poetical; bearing the same relation to poetry that picturesque does to painting.

To the second :—I refer my reader to the example of BLACKMORE and BOILEAU, which this opponent has designedly omitted.

To the third :—I deny, if by " *treatment alone*" it be inferred, that the most successful " *treatment*" of epistles, or satires, places a poet in the same file as the most successful " *treatment*" of an epic poem.

This is the logician's own SUMMARY! the rest is confusion worse confounded, quibbles, word-catching, blunders, and fraud, as far as I can comprehend him. He quotes the lines,

> " He who would see Melrose aright,
> Must see it by the *pale moon-light !*"

He quotes COLLINS's Ode to *Fear!!* as if he had never heard that tragedy was founded on *terror* and pity, and as if " fear" was not a passion!

I here leave Mr. M'DERMOT!

Having given this summary of the answer to me, I will conclude by giving a summary of my principles, to which this affects to be an answer:

1. That there are some objects, both in nature and art, more poetical, that is, more adapted to poetry, than others.
2. That those most adapted will be found among the greatest objects in nature.
3. That, as in external nature there exist objects more susceptible of poetry than others, from their beauty, picturesque appearance, ideas excited by the contemplation of power, &c. &c.; so

are the higher passions of the heart, including all that affects the imagination, more adapted to poetry than the manners and habits of any particular period.

4. That the subject, whether of an epic poem, or tragedy, or moral epistles, or satire, must be taken into consideration, before the rank of a poet in his art can be determined, let his execution, in that rank, be what it may.

5. That, be the subject what it may, it must so far depend on the execution, that he who executes, *as well as possible*, a poem on any subject, would be a better poet than he would be, whose subject was an epic, in which the execution entirely failed.

6. That if of three poets, one had executed an epic poem, another a tragedy, and the third a most pathetic epistle, *one* work of exquisite imagination in mock-heroic, with satires, &c.; and that these three poets had executed their several descriptions of poetry with the same perfection, viz. an epic poem, a tragedy, an ode or epistle, or a mock-heroic, or moral essays, or satires; that then, those who had so executed works like Paradise Lost, or dramas like Macbeth, Othello, Tempest, As you like it, &c. would, from the nature of the subjects, and equal execution, according to my principles, and the principles in criticism generally admitted and acknowledged, be pronounced the greatest poets; and, therefore, that POPE, with all his execution, never could be placed in the same rank with MILTON and SHAKESPEARE.[1]

These are the deductions from my principles, which neither LORD BYRON nor MR. CAMPBELL have answered.

---

[1] So far from depreciating POPE, I believe I am the only writer who would place, and who has placed, him above DRYDEN! As to Mr. M'DERMOT's reasonings, they appear to me such as could only be met by ridicule. I should not, indeed, have said a word that looked like disrespect, if he, as well as the Critic in the Quarterly Review, had not used the language of personal flippancies towards me. But, in return for the kindness expressed by him, that, instructed by him, I may remove from the ranks of those "who write dull receipts how poems may be made" (which I have not done); I hope, under the hasty examination which his Letter to me has undergone, "HE may REMOVE" from the ranks of carping verbal hypercritics, to become a critic with larger and more liberal views, to scorn disingenuous perversions, and to use no language, *unprovoked*, which may be thought inconsistent with the character of a fair critic, a candid man, or a liberal scholar.

AN

ANSWER

TO A

WRITER IN THE QUARTERLY REVIEW,

MAINTAINING,

THAT "IN-DOOR NATURE" IS AS POETICAL AS THE MAGNIFICENCE OF THE CREATION;

AND

That exquisite Delineations of Manners entitle a Poet to rank as high in his Art, as exquisite Delineations of the Passions of Nature.

> Non si te ruperis, inquam,
> Par erit. HORACE.

It will be observed, that in Lord BYRON's argument little was said respecting the character of POPE as a Poet; it was a mere literary discussion, evidently in part *badinage*, by Lord BYRON, to prove, in the disdainful loftiness of genius, that he could make black white. It would hardly have required an answer, had not so many unreflecting people deemed it conclusive. In the criticism of the Writer in the Quarterly Review, all is serious and elaborate; and it is so far more difficult to answer, as

> "Your true no-meaning puzzles more than wit."

The substance of the Answer, as far as poetical criticism is concerned, I have here added, that the reader may form his opinion.

DR. WARTON had declared, or, according to the Quarterly Reviewer, had the "MERIT of first declaring, of POPE, that he did not think him at the head of his profession, and that his *species of poetry* was not the most excellent *one* of the art."

This is WARTON's opinion, and this is mine; and this opinion I have supported in the Principles of Poetry; and this opinion I think I can easily defend (though I believe that so *defined* it will be generally admitted) against Dr. JOHNSON, Mr. CAMPBELL, and the Quarterly Reviewer. But first for Dr. JOHNSON. What says the Doctor?

"To circumscribe poetry by a definition will only show the narrowness of the definer. If POPE be not a poet, where is poetry to be found?" He might as well have said, "If the LARK be not a *singing bird*, where is a *singing bird* to be found?" Such is the Doctor's logic!

"Aye! but such a definer," adds the critic, "arose in the disciple of WARTON, the Rev. W. L. BOWLES, who has distinguished himself in this IDLE controversy." Now, such a *definer* did not arise in W. L. B. He was not so absurd as to attempt "circumscribing" poetry to ONE species, and to that ONE SPECIES ALONE! He never thought, and never implied he thought, that POPE was not a poet, or that any definition would exclude him from a most high order; but, when vague claims were made, as they now are, respecting his absolute supremacy in the art—not his line of art—the Rev. W. L. BOWLES thought, and does think, *not* that POPE was not a poet, a poet the most finished and most excellent in his order, but that his order was not the highest in poetry, whilst HOMER, and SHAKESPEARE, and MILTON remain.

And he must here also observe, that he did not enter into this "idle controversy" voluntarily, but was forced into it by total misrepresentation.

I proceed to consider the other authority which this critic advances, namely, that of Mr. CAMPBELL.

The sentence in which the authority of his name is produced is this:

"Mr. BOWLES opens his observations on the poetic character of POPE, with two regular propositions: that IMAGES drawn from what is SUBLIME or BEAUTIFUL in Nature are MORE poetical than images drawn from art; and that passions are more adapted to poetry than manners."

This is my proposition, which I think substantially unanswerable. I had said I was obliged to the writer for being so far fair, *in this one instance,* as not to leave out the latter part of the sentence!! But the writer did not do so; he *falsified the passage* on *purpose,* leaving out "*artificial!*" *Hæ tibi erunt artes!* Nevertheless, I take it as it is. This is my position, and I think it unanswered and unanswerable.

For the sake of clearness, I shall re-state the grounds of my opinions.

"All images drawn from what is BEAUTIFUL or SUBLIME in the WORKS of NATURE, are *more* beautiful and sublime than any images drawn from art,[1] and they are, therefore, *per se,* (abstractedly,) more poetical! In like manner, those PASSIONS of the human heart, which belong to NATURE in general, are *per se* more adapted to the higher species of poetry than INCIDENTAL and transient manners!"

I have not Mr. CAMPBELL's Specimens at hand, and as I am now answering the critic in the Quarterly Review who brings the passage against me, I must take the words before me.

---

[1] This is an axiom, not a "theory."

"Mr. CAMPBELL judges, that the *exquisite* description of artificial objects and manners is NOT LESS CHARACTERISTIC of GENIUS than the description of *simple physical appearances!*"

In the first place, CAMPBELL overlooked entirely what I had made the chief principle of poetry, taking his opinions at second-hand from the Edinburgh Review. The critic here confines himself to the *first part* of my proposition. Instead of answering even this part, he says, the "exquisite description" of works of art is not less characteristic of genius than descriptions of *simple* PHYSICAL APPEARANCES! Doubtless! but one half, and that the most essential, of my proposition is entirely omitted, and the other half mistaken. Why not take the plain words of the two propositions, and answer "negatur"?

Without talking of "exquisite description" of art as "characteristic of genius," will any one deny, that "images, drawn from what is SUBLIME OR BEAUTIFUL in the works of NATURE, are MORE beautiful and sublime than any images drawn from art, and therefore, *per se, abstractedly,* MORE POETICAL?" Will this critic deny it? Then, why confound the proposition, by talking of "characteristics of genius," and that genius indefinite? Doubtless! because Mr. CAMPBELL must define what he means by genius. COWLEY had as much *genius* as MILTON, but not for the highest orders of poetry.

I used the words *per se, designedly,* to show that, let works of art be as sublime or beautiful as they might, images drawn from what is SUBLIME or BEAUTIFUL in NATURE, that is, from the great and beautiful works of the Almighty, are MORE so, and therefore more poetical, more adapted to poetry.

What would be the most exquisite description of Mr. CAMPBELL's ship, *abstractedly,* as a poetical object, in comparison with the description of the same ship, in conjunction with the elements of nature? This I have shown; nor have I said any thing as to the point whether the "*exquisite description*" of this object or of that is "most characteristic of genius!" I spoke of the invariable principles of poetry. An "exquisite" painting on a snuff-box may be, for aught I have said to the contrary, characteristic of genius, so far as *exquisite skill* goes, in that line; but the most exquisite skill in that line cannot make a painter so eminent in all that relates to the higher orders of his art, as the Cartoons conceived by the genius, and EXECUTED by the hand, of a RAPHAEL!

I turn from Dr. JOHNSON and Mr. CAMPBELL to my critic. I will show more fairness to him than he has shown to me, by transcribing, word for word, not "splitting sentences," the whole *luminous* passage in which he displays so *triumphantly* his consummate analytical powers of philosophy and criticism.

"It is clear to us that a theory, which, frequently admitting every thing the votary of POPE could desire, to substantiate the high genius of his master, yet terminates in excluding the poet from 'the highest order of poets,' must involve some *fallacy;* and this we presume we have discovered in the absurd attempt to raise 'a *criterion* of poetical talents.' Such an *artificial test* is repugnant to the man of taste who can take enlarged views, and to the experience of the *true critic.* In the contrast of human tempers and habits, in the changes of circumstances in society, and the consequent mutations of tastes, the objects of poetry may be different in different periods; pre-eminent genius obtains its purpose by its adaptation to this eternal variety; and on this principle, if we would justly appreciate the creative faculty, we cannot see why POPE should not class, at least in file, with DANTE or MILTON. It is probable that POPE could not have produced an 'Inferno,' or a 'Paradise Lost,' for his invention was elsewhere: but it is equally probable that DANTE and MILTON, with their cast of mind, could not have so exquisitely touched the refined gaiety of 'the Rape of the Lock.'

"It has frequently been attempted to raise up such arbitrary standards and such narrowing theories of art; and these criterions and 'invariable principles' have usually been drawn from the habitual practices and individual tastes of the framers; they are a sort of concealed egotism, a stratagem of self-love. When Mr. BOWLES informs us that one of the *essential* qualities of a poet 'is to have *an eye attentive to* and *familiar with*' (for so he strengthens his canons of criticism) 'every external appearance of nature, every change of season, every variation of light and shade, every rock, every tree, every leaf, every diversity of hue, &c.;' we all know who the poet is that Mr. BOWLES so fondly describes.[1] 'Here, POPE,' he adds, 'from infirmities and from physical causes, was particularly deficient.' In *artificial* life, 'he perfectly succeeded; how minute in his description when he describes what he is master of! for instance, the game of ombre in the Rape of the Lock.—If he had been gifted with the same powers of observing *outward nature,* I have no doubt he would have exhibited as much accuracy in describing the appropriate beauties of the forest where he lived, as he was able to describe in a manner so novel, and in colors so vivid, a game of cards.' It happened, however, that POPE preferred *in-door* to *out-door* nature; but did this require inferior skill, or less of the creative faculty, than Mr. BOWLES's *nature?* In POPE's *artificial life* we discover a great deal of *nature;* and in Mr. BOWLES's *nature,* or poetry, we find much that is *artificial.* On this absurd principle of definition and criterion, Mr. WORDSWORTH, who is often by genius so true a poet, is by his theory so mistaken a one. DARWIN, too, ascertained that 'the invariable principle of poetry,' or, in his own words, 'the essence of poetry,' was picture. This was a convenient principle for one whose solitary talent lay in the minute pencillings of his descriptions; and the idea was instantly adopted as being so consonant to nature, and to Alderman BOYDELL, that our author-painters now asserted, that if the excellence of a poem consisted in forming a picture, the more perfect poetry would be painting itself:—in consequence of this 'invariable principle of poetry,' Mr. SHEE, in his brilliant 'Rhymes on Art,' declared, that 'the *narrative of an action*' is not comparable to the '*action itself before the eyes;*' and BARRY ardently exclaimed, 'that painting is poetry realised!' To detract from what itself is excellent, by parallels with another species of excellence, or by trying it by some arbitrary criterion, will ever terminate, as here, in false criticism and absurd depreciation."—*Quarterly Review.*

---

[1] In this passage I had in view only *descriptive* poets, particularly THOMSON and COWPER! so that there was no "concealed egotism" in the matter.

I beg the reader attentively to peruse this passage, which is so *luminous,* in comparison of my "mystic dreams," and which exhibits such powers of logical and accurate discrimination. I might say, as CHILLINGWORTH did, when he heard that KNOX, the Jesuit, was engaged in controversy against him,

Si Pergama dextra
Defendi possent, etiam hac defensa videbo!

I have already set before the reader the whole of my positions, which he has garbled. And first, I would ask any one, who compares my general passage with that in the Quarterly, to say, *bona fide,* which he thinks the most obscure? Any one, in half a moment, could perceive that, in speaking of the "execution" of a poem, I spoke figuratively, having taken the expressions "subject" and "execution" metaphorically, from the art of painting. I will not insult the reader's understanding by supposing he is ignorant of the meaning of the terms employed to define "execution." The words are familiar to every artist, and almost to every common reader. Need I say what is the *execution* of a poem?—The whole performance. The disposition?—The distribution of the several parts. The contrast of light and shade? The effect produced by opposing one part to another. Relief, light and shade, contrast, colors of expression, animation, &c. are all taken figuratively from one and "the same art," painting, and are common expressions of criticism. See JOHNSON, POPE, &c.

And now to apply to the *logic* before us:—

"It is CLEAR to us, that a *theory*, which, frequently admitting every thing the votary of POPE could desire, to *substantiate the high genius* of his master, yet *terminates* in excluding the poet from '*the highest order of poets*,' must involve *some fallacy!*" Which commencement seems to imply, that if a poet is admitted to be of a very high order, he must therefore necessarily be also of the "HIGHEST ORDER!" But the logician's sagacity is not long before it begins to perceive the "*fallacy!*" "And this we presume we have DISCOVERED in the absurd attempt to RAISE A CRITERION OF POETICAL TALENTS."

My "criterion" went only to ascertain the rank in poetry, to which the successful execution of an epic poem, a tragedy, or satire, severally entitled the authors. If SHAKESPEARE had written satire, equal, in execution, as satire, even to Macbeth, would he have been so great a poet? The question answers itself.

As I have never said any thing about "criterion," farther than concerned the "*execution*" of a poem, I presume the critic is not a jot nearer discovering the fallacy, if fallacy there be, than he was before!

From the "fallacy," which the critic presumes he has discovered, he goes on rapidly. "Such an artificial test is repugnant to the man of taste, who can take ENLARGED views, and to the experience of the TRUE CRITIC!"—*Quarterly Review*.

The "theory," of which this "TRUE CRITIC" has found the *fallacy*, next becomes an "artificial test;" and now the "fallacy" and "artificial test" are thus summarily and satisfactorily proved, by those who have "such enlarged views!"

Reader,

"Attentis auribus adsta!"

"In the *contrast* of *human tempers* and *habits*, in the *changes of circumstances in society*, and the consequent MUTATION OF TASTES, the OBJECTS of poetry MAY BE DIFFERENT in *different periods!!*" Indeed!

I marvel, then, what could have made HOMER the ETERNAL FATHER OF POETRY, amidst all contrast of human tempers and habits, in all changes of society, in all mutations of taste. But we must not interrupt the now rapidly running stream of this frothy and shallow sophistry.

Contrast of "tempers and habits, changes of circumstances in society, mutation of tastes!" These, *not* passions, imaginations, affections, are the most sublime and beautiful objects of poetry, and these are all *changeable*, as changes of society, and mutation of "taste," operate! "Pre-eminent genius," we are told, "attains its purpose by its adaptation to "this eternal variety;" (the eternal variety of *habits, tastes*, &c.) and now for "*quod erat demonstrandum*;"

thus, my "fallacy" being overturned, the opposite principles being readily granted—that the objects of poetry are *mutable*, not *eternal*, as *mutable* as "*habits* and *fashions*," then we jump to the conclusion, which thus instantaneously follows! "On this *principle*, if we would JUSTLY APPRECIATE the *creative faculty*, WE CANNOT see why POPE should not class, at least in file, with DANTE and MILTON!"—*Quarterly Review*.

"We deem this matter well made out," said "John the Saint," to "Mat," in PRIOR's witty fable of "Erle Robert's Mice!" and if our readers think it as well "*made out*" by such "*fallacies*" as these, and such baseless arguments, *à la bonne heure!*

In the mean time, not to impede the career of this "true" critic's triumph, let us see what follows.

"It is PROBABLE POPE could not have produced an Inferno, or Paradise Lost." (Probably not:) "for his invention lay elsewhere:" (undoubtedly, and among subjects less poetical; but) it "is *equally probable* that MILTON and DANTE could not have so exquisitely touched the refined gaiety of the Rape of the Lock!" Probably not; but, *Dii boni!* what a discovery! who would have surmised, that MILTON and DANTE, WITH THEIR CAST of MIND, could not so exquisitely have touched the refined gaiety of the "Rape of the Lock!" *Therefore*, is POPE of "the *same file* with MILTON and DANTE!"

Even for this last thought the writer is indebted to one, whose criticism he holds so cheap; though I should never have thought of applying the observation as is here done, that because MILTON could not write the Rape of the Lock, and POPE could not write Paradise Lost, *one* poet was in the same file with the *other!*

Merely to show that some great critics may borrow of those "whose principles" they affect to despise, I extract a note to POPE's Rape of the Lock, from the last edition.

"This poem is founded, however, upon local manners, and of all poems of that kind it is undoubtedly far the best; whether we consider the exquisite tone of raillery, the musical sweetness, &c. of the versification, the management of the story, or the kind of fancy and airiness given to the whole: but what entitles it to its high claim of peculiar poetic excellencies?—The powers of imagination, and the felicity of invention, displayed in adopting, and most artfully conducting, a *machinery* so fanciful, so appropriate, so novel, and so poetical. The introduction of Discord, &c. as machinery in the Lutrin, is not to be mentioned at the same time. Such a being as Discord will suit a hundred subjects; but the elegant, the airy sylph,

'Loose to the wind whose airy garments flew,
Thin glittering textures of the filmy dew,

Dipt in the richest tincture of the skies,
Where light disports, in ever mingling dyes:'

such a being as this is suited alone to the identical and peculiar poem in which it is employed. I will now go a step farther in appreciating the elegance and beauty of this poem; and I would ask the question,—Let any other poet, DRYDEN, WALLER, COWLEY, or GRAY, *be assigned* this subject, and this *machinery*: could they have produced a work *altogether so correct* and *beautiful,* from the same given materials? Let us, however, still remember, that this poem is founded on *local manners,* and the employment of the sylphs is in *artificial life;* for this reason the poem must have a secondary rank, when considered strictly and truly with regard to its poetry. Whether POPE would have excelled as much in loftier subjects, of a general nature, in the high mood of Lycidas, the rich colorings of Comus, and magnificent descriptions and sublime images of Paradise Lost? or in painting the characters and employments of aerial beings,'

'That tread the ouse of the salt deep,
Or run upon the sharp wind of the north,'

is another question. He has not attempted it; I have no doubt he would have failed; but to have produced a poem infinitely the highest of its kind, and which no other poet could perhaps altogether have done so well, is surely very high praise. The *excellence is* POPE's *own, the inferiority is in the subject;* no one understood better that excellent rule of HORACE,

'Sumite materiem, &c.'—BOWLES'S POPE."

I give this extract for you to ponder on; in the mean time, I must ask, Why do you say I have pronounced the "subjects" of POPE's poetry *not poetical?* Why, in the language of that entertaining book, the "Quarrels of Authors," "perplex controversy by a SUBTLE change of a word?" This art you have studied with the greatest success, as you have so well and so admirably illustrated it, (in another place of this identical criticism, which will be hereafter spoken of) "by breaking up of a sentence," or contriving some ABSURDITY in the shape of inference, to get rid of it in a "MOCK TRIUMPH!"[1]

Now if, in this illustration of the "subtle arts," by which "controversy is perplexed," you had not *left out*, *subtilely*, one small word, consisting of two letters "(so)," my meaning would not have been "perplexed," nor would such disingenuous modes of meeting a question have assumed for a moment the appearance of a "mock triumph!" Have the goodness to insert the little word "so," which you thus *subtilely* left out, and you will not do injustice to me or the public; for my meaning will then be (to which I adhere, notwithstanding all such profound arguments as you have brought against it) that the "subjects" of satires are not so "POETICAL" as those subjects which appeal to the imagination and passions.

---

[1] An example of *all these arts* is shown in this very criticism of the Quarterly Review, leaving out the word "so," which makes all the difference; "breaking up a sentence," as is literally done, and *shamefully,* in what is said of Mr. BOWLES's want of having "explained himself," when the sentence which elucidates his meaning is entirely left out; and this is done, by "contriving *some absurdity,* in the shape of an inference, to get rid of it by a *mock triumph!*" Who that observes these *arts* does not instantly exclaim, These *little* weapons, against the laws of war, are *insidiously* practised in this WAR OF WORDS!!—QUARRELS OF AUTHORS, page 99.

And if this be admitted, it would follow, that a poem might be in its "execution" (a word which, together with "subject," though so "dark" to this logician, I have taken from POPE'S POSTSCRIPT to the Odyssey!) complete, and yet not be so *poetical* as a GREATER "subject," treated with powers of "execution" in every respect equal to the "subject!"

Then, it would follow that the "Rape of the Lock," though, in point of its peculiar fancy and consummate "execution," it be the most perfect work of the kind in any language, might yet, in point of poetry, remain for ever inferior to such a poem as the Paradise Lost; as much as the beautiful "Belinda," surrounded by white-gloved beaux, on the bosom of the silver Thames, in the summer sunshine, and whilst the sails are fanned by the wings of sylphs, is a picture, though delightful and poetical, far *less poetical* than that, *when*

> "The planets in their stations list'ning stood,
> AS THE BRIGHT POMP ASCENDED JUBILANT."
>
> PARADISE LOST.

You say "*we presume*, we have found the '*fallacy*' of Mr. BOWLES'S *theory!*" Without *presuming* at all, I will point out the *fallacy* of your's in two minutes. It is in confining the invariable principles of poetry to the "*criterion*" of talents, and in supposing I ever conceived that "manners," &c. might not be poetical, when all I said was, that PASSIONS were MORE SO.

No *criterion* of talents, as talents, were spoken of or intended. I confined myself to the "Principles of POETRY," reckoning the more serious as the more sublime, pathetic, or beautiful, and, therefore, the most accordant to the higher class of poetry. But, in this article, no discrimination is made, either from ignorance or confusion of ideas, between the province of epic poetry and that of tragedy or comedy, between poems or novels, I might almost say between *verse* and *prose;* for if talents were to be made a "criterion," they would apply as much, undoubtedly, to the description of manners, as to the pourtraying of passions. Nay, to produce such a poem as Hudibras, or such a history as Don Quixote, would evince certainly as much talents as to produce the

Fairy Queen. But in which would you look for the most essential poetry? Whom would you call the greatest poet?

But the very argument defeats itself. For, if "fluctuating *manners* and *habits*" are subjects as poetical as works of the imagination and passions, the representation of these *manners and habits* can never be perfectly understood, or the propriety of the representation felt, except during the period in which they prevail. As such *manners* and *habits* fluctuate, the representation of them, however interesting at the time, must lose the greatest part of its charm. Is this the case with HOMER, or SOPHOCLES, or EURIPIDES, where the *ακαματον πυρ* never expires? Is this the case with THEOCRITUS, whose *καλα τεμπεα*, &c. are at this moment as beautiful and fresh as when they were first transcribed from living nature? These poets remain, and these will remain, whatever "habits" or "manners" may prevail at different periods, and whatever generations may rise or pass away on the face of the globe.

"By the consent of the critics, (says Dr. JOHNSON,) the FIRST praise of genius is due to the writer of an epic poem, as it requires an assemblage of all the powers which are singly sufficient for any other composition."

Now even this great critic did not take into consideration the "execution," or performance, of the said epic; and, therefore, according to HIS views, not mine, BLACKMORE must be a greater poet than POPE! But this I deny; and must refer the reader to what I before had written concerning the subject and execution of a "poem." Whatever Dr. JOHNSON might have thought of the "universal *consent of the critics*," had he lived to see certain criticisms in the Review we speak of, he would have found some *radicals* in their profession, who cared not a *jot* for this "universal consent;" who confounded epic, tragic, tragicomical, comic, elegiac, "IN-DOOR and out-of-door" nature, the province of morals, novels, and farces; and asserted that, to the writer of moral epistles and satires, the *first praise* of genius is due, *quoad* poetry, as much as to the writer of the epic; and that, therefore, POPE may be, notwithstanding his avowed preference of in-door nature, of the "SAME FILE" WITH MILTON AND DANTE!!![1]

---

[1] This definition, I think, *(pace dixerim,)* is not quite accurate; for, in my opinion, it would have been more just to have said, "the highest praise of poetry is due to the *successful* writer of an epic poem."

Dr. JOHNSON speaks with accurate distinction, and with his usual sense and eloquence, when he says, "Paradise Lost is a poem, with respect to design, which may claim the FIRST place, and with respect to *performance*, the second, among the productions of the human mind. His 'subject' is the fate of worlds, and the revolutions of heaven and earth!"

"The *subject* of this poem is *universally* and *perpetually* interesting;" and

According to this "discovery," all former critics may as well hide their diminished heads, ancient and modern; but this indeed, in the language of the Reviewer, will "BE THE TRIUMPH OF THE FUTURE!" In the mean time, HOMER will remain on his "throne of ADAMANT;" for it must be indeed the "triumph of the future" that would place on the same throne the most poetical writer of moral essays or satires the world ever produced.

The *principles of poetry*, in this sense, are INVARIABLE and ETERNAL.

If the higher principles of poetry be thus *eternal*, it follows that he who exerts his talents on the highest poetical subject; he who sustains a flight equal to that subject; who, in pursuing it, executes, in the most perfect manner, the most sublime subject; he who thus conceives and executes such, and so great, a subject, will stand superior to him who may have displayed as much judgment and powers of *execution* on a gayer and more evanescent theme; and therefore MILTON, and DANTE, and HOMER, and SHAKESPEARE, must stand, in the intrinsic excellence of their art, superior to POPE.

As the critic cannot see why POPE may not be classed in the same file with MILTON and DANTE, we can only wonder, whilst he was so animated with his subject, that he had not also put him in the same file with HOMER and SOPHOCLES, for he might with as much propriety have done one as the other.

And now, Sir, one more word about "principles of poetry." Do you think that there is any art which is not founded on "*some invariable principles?*" There are "invariable principles of painting," "invariable principles of poetry," and let me whisper to you, in every honest mind "invariable principles of criticism," *two* of which are, not to deal dishonestly and fraudulently with the arguments of the writer whose opinion you controvert; not to cut the sentences in halves, and think to "reply" to them

> "By a fool-born jest."

There is another "*invariable principle*" of criticism, which ought to be constantly kept in mind. It is this, "not to write on a subject till you know a little about it!"

As to my own "principles of poetry," suffer me to try once more to set you a little right. DARWIN's principle of trying poetry universally by *painting* is limited and confined indeed; for, by such a criterion, the highest part of poetry, which relates to the imagination and passions, must be excluded. But, with respect to

as "light and shade" is not understood by my critic, any more than "subject and execution," I may just mention some further expressions: "In a GREAT work there are vicissitudes of *luminous* and opaque parts."—LIFE OF MILTON.

the principles you combat being limited and confined, nothing was ever so remote from the truth.

The eye of the poet may be truly said to glance from

> "Earth to heaven,
> From heaven to earth."

The ideal and visible worlds are his province. In the ideal, beings of imagination, connected with images of terror, power, glory, beauty; such as "ride the storm," or "play in the plighted clouds," wake at his bidding. In the visible world, objects and pictures, the most magnificent, or the most lovely in the works of GOD, are before him,—all passions, and affections, and emotions, and sympathies of the heart, are the great poet's peculiar subjects.[1] The principles, then, I have built on, when closely examined, will be found to be those of LONGINUS and HORACE; which are derived primarily from ETERNAL NATURE. But works of art, which can only belong to the "visible diurnal sphere," are not excluded; these, however, become poetical, as they associate more or less with ideas of power, magnificence, beauty, all of which have their origin in NATURE. Thus, "the aqueducts, temples, obelisks," of which MILTON has made so fine a use, become more poetical, as combined with *moral associations* or picturesque effect.

To these succeed high moral satire, habits and manners and characters of artificial life, which may be, in the master's work, mixed and combined, almost *ad infinitum*.

But as poetry approaches this province, it necessarily assumes more the character of wit. And to show that this opinion will not be the "TRIUMPH OF THE FUTURE," as this writer affectedly calls it, I will quote only one passage from that critic, who was the great sublime he drew, and who was, at least, as *true* a *critic* as himself:—

"I have digressed thus far, for the sake of showing as I observed before, that a *decrease* of the pathetic in *great* orators and *poets often ends* in the MORAL KIND OF WRITING. Thus the Odyssey, furnishing us with rules of morality, drawn from that course of life, which the SUITORS lead in THE PALACE OF ULYSSES, has in some degree *the air of a* COMEDY, where the various MANNERS of men are INGENIOUSLY and FAITHFULLY DESCRIBED."—*Longinus.*

The reader will see from the *sketch* I have drawn, that the works of art and manners of men are not—they were never thought of being—excluded from the province of poetry; but be they as poetical as they may, the greater passions are *more* so, and I only contend for this; and that, therefore, Pope, exquisite as he is, cannot be ranked in the same file with the poet of Macbeth, King Lear, or Paradise Lost. As to my definition being limited, I would request to know whose definitions are most limited, those which are bounded by the vastness of heaven, or those which are confined to a London square?

---

[1] Yet, notwithstanding this, I am accused of confining all my ideas of poetry to external nature!

Now, I repeat, nothing was said by me about "a criterion of talents!"—It is probably as difficult to write a good comedy as a fine tragedy—to paint a Falstaff as a Lear. Pope found it more difficult to translate those parts of Homer which were *least poetical;* but it is not these that placed Homer on his eternal throne. It may require, for aught I know, as much talent to describe the "habits and manners of the suitors," and their "in-door nature;" but where does the poetry (in the last books of the Odyssey) lie? Every one will instantly exclaim, in the half-famished dog that recognises his old master, and dies, having seen him; in the affectionate wife, bending over the bow of her long-lost husband; in that husband, after so long an absence, a forlorn stranger in his own hall, essaying and bending it; in the cottage of Eumæus, &c. These are scenes, upon which the feelings rest.—By my "theory," as the critic calls it, which is only common sense, nothing is excluded. Pictures, passions, characters, manners, habits, morals, have all their places. But the characteristic difference, as far as poetry is concerned, is pointed out.

Having mentioned the Odyssey, and quoted what Longinus has so justly said, I may here make some observations on this subject, as they connect themselves with what has been before laid down.

The Odyssey, indeed, as Pope truly says, is not to be compared with the Iliad. "The poems are totally different, but both are *master-pieces* in their kind." Nor is the Rape of the Lock to be compared with the Paradise Lost; but when uncertain claims are made, those works are to be taken into consideration, whether epic, tragic, dramatic, moral, or pathetic, which place the poet HIGHEST in his art,[1] supposing the execution of either equal.

---

[1] We may here observe a remark of Pope on this passage, in his postscript to the Odyssey. Of Longinus he says, "that in his own *particular taste,* and with respect to the SUBLIME, he (Longinus) *preferred* the Iliad," &c.

But Pope adds this particular distinction, "that Horace gives the preference rather to the Odyssey, in the Epistle to Lollius, and in the Art of Poetry!"

It appears to me that Pope seemed to feel that the criticism of Longinus on the sublime in poetry, and what he said of the inferiority of *manners* to *passions,* touched his own character as a poet, who certainly was more distinguished for painting "manners," than reaching the great sublime of his

Associations of Nature may be varied, combined, mixed, almost to infinitude, yet the basis be the same, as to poetical principles, which are referred through all to the source of what is sublime, beautiful, and pathetic; and thus, the eternal line of poetic excellence will NOT "be defined by some *arbitrary criterion*," nor will the inquiry terminate "in *false criticism and absurd depreciation*," but by unvarying principles of "JUST CRITICISM and FAIR APPRECIATION."

Having thus examined in return this "true critic's" theory, let me be indulged in comparing what he calls "Mr. BOWLES's Nature," and what I may surely call *his*—IN-DOOR NATURE.

"Nature," he profoundly observes, "is a critical term which the BOWLES's have been two thousand years EXPLAINING!"

---

art; and therefore he covertly brings in HORACE's opinion, which he thinks is in favor of a poem, a considerable part of which is founded on manners.

But HORACE, in what he said of the Odyssey, either in the Epistle to Lollius, or in the Art of Poetry, had not in view poetry, but morals only. In the Epistle to Lollius, who appears from the text to be a young man likely to be led away by his passions, he especially points out the example of *virtue* and *wisdom:* how Ulysses avoided the cup of Circe, and turned from the song of the Syrens! Then he proceeds to *speak* of the intemperance of the *suitors*, &c. Morals and not poetry were the objects of this epistle, addressed to a young man, who thus might learn from his own early studies, not so much the lessons of taste, but, what he more needed, regulation of conduct. In the Art of Poetry, when HORACE speaks particularly of the unassuming introduction of the Odyssey, in opposition to the bombast style which he reproves, he fixes the imagination directly on the *poetical* parts of the Odyssey, arising from an humble beginning, like fire rising from smoke, —and expressly says of HOMER, that from hence he draws—

"speciosa miracula,
Antiphaten, Scyllam, et cum Cyclope Charybdin."

And HORACE has not left unrecorded his precise definition of poetry, when he says so distinctly,

"Neque, si quis scribat, uti nos,
Sermoni propiora, PUTES hunc esse Poëtam.
Ingenium cui sit, cui mens divinior, atque os
Magna sonaturum, des NOMINIS HUJUS HONOREM."

And he brings an example more particular still, that there might never be a misunderstanding of his meaning in appreciating the high rank of the Father of Poetry:

"Non, si priores Mæonius tenet
Sedes Homerus, Pindaricæ latent,
Ceæque et Alcæi minaces,
Stesichorique *graves* Camœnæ.
Nec, si quid olim lusit Anacreon,
Delevit ætas; spirat adhuc amor,
Vivuntque commissi calores
Æoliæ fidibus puellæ."

Now, would any one think, that because HORACE gave the first place to HOMER, he "*depreciates*," or sought to depreciate, the exquisite beauty of SAPPHO?

Who and what the Bowles's are, I know as little, as this arch-cockney, when he "sits down to square the circle," knows of Nature; but this I am sure, the family of the Bowles's are honored by the remark, inasmuch as they may be considered lovers of the great prototype of all that is sublime or beautiful in art.

If any "explanation" were necessary, the Bowles's need not be consulted, when even in criticism the expressive language was at hand, from authority that will not be doubted:

> "First, follow Nature, and your judgment frame
> By her just standard, which is still the same.
> Unerring Nature, still divinely bright,
> One clear, unchanged, and universal light,
> Life, force, and beauty, must to all impart,
> At once the source, and end, and test, of art!!"
>
> *Essay on Criticism.*

This general opinion, thus admirably and elegantly expressed, will be quite sufficient to justify me in what I have laid down, even if it should not be so clear as I wish to make it; and if the Bowles's have been for two thousand years ringing chimes and changes on the term "Nature," they may well imagine that some few others may indeed hope to succeed in their "*favorite studies* of squaring the *circle,*" before they can comprehend it—certainly they must look beyond that "*Nature*" which is bounded by "four walls!" and which, blind to the magnificence of the Creation, they facetiously designate as "In-door Nature," and think a poet, who preferred this Nature, to be in the same file with Homer, and Shakespeare, and Milton, and Dante!

Turning from a critic of this description, I would here address some particular observations to the reader.

Mr. Campbell made an unfortunate appeal to Milton, with respect to his having, in his sublimest parts of Paradise Lost, drawn images *from art*. I hope to be excused, if, in speaking on this point, I examine somewhat more closely Milton's examples in general.

There are some passages which, without considering the cause, strike almost every reader with a kind of instinctive and involuntary dislike. Some of these passages will perhaps instantly occur. Who does not draw back with peculiar distaste from those passages where the Satanic army bring their great guns charged with the gunpowder? Why is this? Because an image of art is brought too close, and too immediately and distinctly to our view! The same may be said, when the Creator applies the "golden compasses" to mark the orb of the world! The image is taken from art, and brought too *distinctly* into our view! The same may be said, when Death and Sin build a "bridge" from Hell to this world!

These images from art are all too manifestly and too minutely in sight. But this is not the case in general, where MILTON introduces images from art. They are placed before us, if I may say so, by a *single* evanescent touch—you are not left to *dwell* on them—and most commonly some epithet is added, to *generalise* them with higher imagery.

Thus, if the trumpet is mentioned, an indistinct grandeur is given to it by the epithet "the ARCH-ANGEL *trumpet*." The *wheels* of the *brazen chariot* are alive—"The madding wheels of brazen chariots raged."

If Satan lifts his shield, it is the "*rocky orb* of vast circumference." The "swords" are "fiery;" the "shields," "two BRIGHT SUNS, THAT BLAZE opposite."

The adjunct, generally taken from some magnificent object in Nature, subdues what has a too mechanical appearance, and this tends to exalt the image, as well as to prevent the imagination dwelling too minutely on it.

Gold, the most precious stones, are often added as epithets, where the naked image from *art* wants exalting: in other cases, a word is joined for the sake of taking off and shadowing, if I may say so, the too distinctive glare of an *artificial* image.

It is for want of attending to this nice propriety, (which in MILTON, with the exception of some passages, appears instinctive,) that COWLEY is generally so absurd in his imagery,—as when he makes art and nature coachman and postilion, &c.

If COWLEY had used the image of the angel *unfurling* Satan's standard from the "*staff*," he would, probably, have *minutely* described it. MILTON scarce touches the image; but how does he instantly exalt it, by associating it with the most striking and awful image from nature!

> "a Cherub tall,
> Who, forthwith, from the *glittering* staff unfurl'd
> The *Imperial* ensign, which, full high advanced,
> Shone, like a meteor, streaming to the *wind!*"

The building of Pandemonium is associated with ideas of super-earthly POWER. When it rises

> "LIKE AN EXHALATION, to the sound
> Of dulcet symphonies,"

every thing accords with the ideas of immense size and grandeur.

Is not this in some measure destroyed, when MILTON speaks more minutely of pilasters, and Doric pillars, and architraves, and cornice, and frieze? And how repulsive is the image (it is to me) of Belial himself digging out the gold, pounding the ore, and scumming the dross; and the simile of the "sound board," and *row* of pipes of the organ!

One image is peculiar, and very sublime, in the use of an image drawn from art, where Satan

> "above the rest,
> In shape and gesture proudly eminent,
> Stood, LIKE A TOW'R."

Here is an instant image of immoveable strength: but if the "tower" had been particularised, by one stroke introducing battlements, pinnacles, corbels, &c. the image would have lost so much grandeur; but "stood, like a tower," at once conveys a distinct idea of stately and immoveable strength, by a single word; and it may here be observed, having spoken of the "sounding-board" of an organ, that almost all *musical instruments*, as *sounding*, (not otherwise,) are poetical. Why? Because the sound instantly assimilates itself with some kindred feeling or passion—as the flute with tenderness, the viol with sprightliness, the trumpet with heroic animation. Scott, of Amwell, has made a fine and original use of the drum by the association of sadness and pity—

> "I *hate* that drum's discordant sound,
> Parading round, and round, and round."

The late Mrs. SHERIDAN has given to the sound "*of the violin*" a poetical feeling, which is as new as beautiful and affecting, where she speaks of her brother, bringing forth those tones *that live beyond the touch!*

> "Ah! who, like him, can teach the liquid notes,
> So soft, so sweet, so eloquently clear,
> TO LIVE BEYOND THE TOUCH, and gently float
> In dying modulations on the ear?"

But let us look a little farther abroad.

Take any work of art, how little, considered as a work of art, can you make it POETICAL, without adjuncts from Nature!

Take useful or decorative architecture, statuary, pictures, carvings, music, bridges, aqueducts, canals, &c.

Take an elegant mansion, or an old abbey:—It would be ridiculous to say which, as an object, is most poetical. Undoubtedly that which is rendered more interesting by various moral associations and picturesque beauty. Time, that leans on the reft battlements, brings with it a thousand associations of sublimity and melancholy. These are most poetically affecting! Even external adventitious circumstances of Nature make the picture more peculiarly and intensely interesting:

> "Scarce *a sickly straggling* flower
> Decks the rough castle's rifted tower."—WARTON.
>
> "He, who would see Melrose aright,
> Must see it by *the pale moonlight*."—SCOTT.

But, one of the finest pictures of modern poetry, where Nature makes the works of art so much more effectually poetical, is to be found in the Gladiator dying in the Coliseum, who remembers, as he dies, "the scenes of his infancy, the hut of his mother, on the banks of the Danube."

"I see before me the Gladiator lie:
He leans upon his hand his manly brow;
Consents to death, but conquers agony:
And his droop'd head sinks gradually low;
And from his side the last drops, ebbing slow
From the sad gash, fall heavy, one by one,
Like the first drops of a thunder-shower; and now
The arena swims around him.—He is gone
Ere ceased the inhuman sound which hail'd the wretch
who won.

He heard it, but he heeded not. His eyes
Were with his heart, and that was far away:
He reck'd not of the life he lost, nor prize;
But where his rude hut by the Danube lay,
There were his young barbarians all at play,
There was their Dacian mother. He, their sire,
Butcher'd to make a Roman holiday!
All this rush'd with his blood. Shall he expire,
And unaveng'd? Arise, ye Goths, and glut your ire."[1]

In the "Faithful Shepherdess" of BEAUMONT and FLETCHER are two similes, immediately succeeding each other, one from a beautiful image in nature, the other from a common one of *human* art—

"Holy virgin, I will dance
Round about these woods as quick
As THE BREAKING LIGHT, and prick
Down the lawns, and down the vales,
Faster than the WIND-MILL SAILS!"

It is the "sails careering in the wind" that gives such *poetical* effect to the last image. How exquisite is a picture from the finest poem of the present age—

"It was the hour
Of vespers, but no vesper-bell was heard,
Nor other SOUND, than of the *passing stream.*
Or *stork*, who, *flapping with wide wing the air,*
Sought her broad nest upon the SILENT *tower.*"—SOUTHEY.

A clock, as a work of art, is not very poetical; but its sound at night is poetical in the highest degree: more so when associated with moral feelings—the time past—the time perpetually going on —Why is this? Because we hear the sound—

"As if an angel spoke."

A striking circumstance of this kind is to be found in Wilson's City of the Plague. The clock is *motionless!* There is no poetry in this circumstance, abstractedly; but how deeply, how affectingly, is it rendered poetry, when the circumstance that has caused it to cease is taken into consideration, and is felt to be the strongest proof of the death and silence of a multitudinous city almost devastated!

---

[1] This has been already spoken of.

This point is so certain, so clear, that I feel almost lessened in self-estimation, that it should appear necessary to bring any proof of what ninety-nine men in a hundred, of common sense and taste, acknowledge and feel.

The two greatest works of art that are introduced in ancient poetry are the *carved* cup in THEOCRITUS, and the shield of Achilles in HOMER. But how is the description of these works of art rendered more peculiarly poetical, by animating them,—by making the objects represented in them *live*, and become as if a part of Nature! The dead carving is not remembered, when we see the old fisher, with his swelling muscles, near the gray rock, not on the cup, but as in the very landscapes of Nature. It is the same in the shield: the *creation*, the sun, the moon, the concourse of citizens, the shepherds, &c. all are represented, not as in dead art, but as living and moving. And it is this necessity of losing as much as possible the idea of the work of art, and fixing the eye and thought on the works of Nature herself, which give the only interesting and most poetical charm.

This position has been disputed in two literary journals, to which we have been taught to look for sound principles of critical investigation.

The first, the Edinburgh Review, now admits what it at first did not: at least, in the review of CAMPBELL's Specimens, it is said,

"They incline to my opinion!" I have no doubt, the more they think of it, or the more Mr. JEFFREY thinks of it, the more he will be inclined to admit it. I have the same opinion of the most intelligent writers of the Quarterly Review, and indeed of every one, except that "unfortunate wight" who was permitted to "fret his hour upon the stage," to talk such strange nonsense about "In-door Nature!!"

To this gentleman I shall now point out, by way of apology for representations that may be to him as dark as Muggletonian dreams, some images both from Art and Nature, which himself may estimate.

COWLEY calls *Nature* a *postilion*, and *Art* a *coachman*:

> "Let the *postilion*, NATURE, mount, and let
> The *coachman*, ART, be set—."

COWLEY, whose "language of the heart" we still love, notwithstanding these vagaries, seems very fond of images drawn from "in-door" nature. So he says, speaking of the "blue sky," it would make an admirable waistcoat for an arch-angel:

"He *cuts out* a *silk mantle* from the skies,
Where the most *sprightly azure* pleas'd the eyes."

A rainbow also forms a most elegant scarf, *fitted*, from the same *pattern*, with the same scissars of art:—

"Of a *new* rainbow, ere it fret and fade,
The *choicest piece* CUT OUT, a scarf is made."

HORACE says,

"NATURAM expellas furca, tamen usque redibit;"

and even here, in spite of COWLEY'S bad taste, which I have no doubt the critic will approve, NATURE steps in, and we have one beautiful image, "the rainbow, *ere it fret and fade!*"

To turn from the poet to the critic. I have no doubt some of the images from art here brought together, have been much more clear to him, and much more satisfactory, than the "dreams" of which our extracts from works of poetry were before filled.

Thus, *Art*, the postilion, and *Nature*, the coachman, and the angel in a new cloak of SKY-BLUE, must have been images probably congenial to his heart; and who can leave the subject without endeavouring to impress on the imagination, that perhaps the most sublime image of all the works of "in-door nature," is that "king of shreds and patches," who once, for a sight of "rural nature," went as far as BRENTFORD! and as this heroic personage is, doubtless, of all images of "in-door Nature" the most sublime; so the "bird" which attends him, though not so sublime as "*ministrum fulminis alitem*," must be admitted, of all images of in-door nature, to be the most *beautiful*.

This bird, which in poetical beauty "arches its head" more than "certain swans," is vulgarly called a *goose;* and if the *terrible* be thought as necessary for this poetical assemblage, "Hell" yawns from beneath,

"*Flectere si nequeo superos, Acheronta movebo!*"

As I would have the critical admirer of the SUBLIME, and BEAUTIFUL, and TERRIBLE, of "in-door" nature, to be like the LONGINUS of Pope,

"The great subline he draws,"

I know not how I could better please him, than by comparing him with that emblem of in-door beauty attendant on its triumphant master, and generally described "as hot as heavy," the GOOSE!!

Begging the reader to pardon this involuntary association, I must proceed to expose, not criticism, but that which is worse than absurdity, the utter destitution of all feelings fair and honorable as a controversialist. I must expose a species of duplicity, which has no example in the character of him whom this writer defends, and whom, I fear, from the *soreness* which he evinces, when some obvious parts of his character are touched, he more nearly resembles. I make the following remarks on the criticism in the Quarterly Review with pain.

Reader, in the "Invariable Principles of Poetry" this passage occurs:

"Now I would put to you a few plain questions; and I would beseech you not to ask whether I mean this or that, for I think you must now *understand what I do mean.* I would beseech you also not to write *beside* the *question,* but answer simply and plainly whether you think that the sylph of POPE, "trembling over the froth of a coffee-cup," be an image as poetical as the delicate and quaint Ariel, who sings

"Where the bee sucks, there lurk I;"

or the elves of SHAKSPEARE—

"Spirits of another sort,
That with the morning light make sport."

Whether you think the description of a game of cards be as *poetical,* supposing the execution in the artists equal, as a description of a *walk* in a *forest?* Whether an age of refinement be as conducive to pictures of poetry, as a period less refined? Whether passions, affections, &c., of the human heart, be not a higher source of what is pathetic or sublime in poetry, than manners and habits, or manners, that apply only to artificial life?

"If you agree with me, it is all I meant to say; if not, we differ, and always shall, on the principles of poetical *criticism.*"

I believe most sincerely that every reader, without exception, will understand my meaning in the passage, when taken together.

But the critic in the Quarterly Review takes the *first sentence,* and no more—then makes a poor and affected banter, that "Mr. BOWLES wants explaining *himself;*" when, but for this his dishonest and dishonorable stratagem, no one would or could have doubted his meaning!

This is what a writer, who has written "On the Quarrels of Authors," calls "breaking up a sentence," for the purpose of securing a momentary "mock-triumph!" Are such "*arts*" of criticism, well as they seem to be understood, worthy a scholar—a gentleman? worthy a publication as distinguished as the Quarterly Review?

Well might this same writer say, "We suspect Mr. BOWLES does not like criticism!"

Such criticism, connected with such stratagems, he "DOES NOT LIKE," and trusts he never shall.

What this "TRUE CRITIC, of ENLARGED views," calls "FASH-

IONABLE CRITICISM," is, in general, equally abhorrent from the principles of every upright man; and, distinguished as are some of the masterly and eloquent articles in the Quarterly Review, as far as poetry and works of taste are concerned, the writers have at least evinced their *sincerity* in one respect, that is, to have "NO PRINCIPLES" at all! either in poetry or criticism.

Having thus replied to what appears most essential in the criticism of the Quarterly, I would willingly part with my Reviewer; but a few words more may be added on his concluding observations respecting the poetical character of him whose life and writings have caused these animadversions.

It is said, "In vain would our *populace* of poets *estrange* themselves from Pope, because

> "He stoop'd to truth, and moralized his song."

Answer. Where he *stoop'd to truth*, and moralized his song, his province is no longer that of imagination and PASSION; it is, and it must be, "truth and morals," and not "imagination and passion," the highest sources of the terrible, sublime, pathetic, and beautiful in poetry. But who, "*among the populace of poets*," would "estrange" themselves from Pope I know not. He has attained an unquestioned, an unrivalled place, in his own line of poetry, from which I should pity any one who could wish or attempt to remove him. His excellence in his art is unrivalled, and I, for one, have admitted that he stands before every poet in his line of art, ancient or modern.

Is Horace no great poet? Is Juvenal no great poet? Are Ovid, Tibullus, Catullus, no great poets? I have already said, and I must repeat, his Eloisa stands as much above the elegies of Catullus, Tibullus, and Ovid, as his satires are above those of Juvenal and Horace. Will the reader believe I have said this distinctly and unreservedly before?

If, in looking over what is remarked specifically of the Satires, I have dwelt too much on his bitter tone of personal invective, it was not for want of feeling his beauties that I did not say more, but because I thought, on these points, it was excellence that all admitted. I have endeavoured to show upon what principles his line of poetry could not be pronounced the most excellent, whilst Homer and Shakspeare, and Sophocles, and Euripides, live; and to prevent that confusion which often arises when we pronounce that this poet, or that painter, is at the head of his art! But, I should think that not only the "populace of poets," but all who have any discriminating sense and taste; who, whilst they know what distinguishes Milton and Dante, know also what distinguishes Pope; who read him, and recur to him, as much as *they* do who think he is "disparaged," have admitted, and cheerfully admit, that he carried his art to the highest point of excellence, as far as his own excellence, in his own line, was concerned; that all who went before, in this line, never reached, and all who come after probably never will reach, this excellence; that he will still remain unrivalled for "the correctness and delicacy of his taste, as well as the vigor of his judgment;" that in "poetical expression" and versification, (with some abatements in the latter,) he will be superior, as long as poetical expression and exquisite versification distinguish his species of excellence; but that, nevertheless, "nature," not manners—passion and imagination, not "truth" or morals,—will afford the highest specimens of the works of a great poet, provided the execution equals the subject, in spite of Quarterly Reviewers and all the FAMILY of GILCHRISTS, or D'ISRAELIS, in the world!

END OF NO XL.

AUG 2 6 1930